

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,

OR
CRITICAL JOURNAL:

FOR
JANUARY, 1881 APRIL, 1881.

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR.

PUBLIUS SYRUS.

VOL. CLIII.

LONGMANS, GREEN, READER, AND DYER, LONDON.
ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK,
EDINBURGH.

1881.

LONDON : PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

CONTENTS OF No. 313.

	Page
ART. I.—1. Mémoires, documents, et écrits divers laissés par le Prince de Metternich, Chancelier de Cour et d'Etat, publiés par son Fils, le Prince R. de Metternich. Première partie, depuis la Naissance de Metternich jusqu'au Congrès de Vienne, 1773–1815. 2 vols. Paris: 1880.	
2. Beer, Zehn Jahre österreichischer Politik, 1801–10. 1877.	
3. Oncken, Oesterreich und Preussen im Befreiungskriege. Urkundliche Aufschlüsse über die politische Geschichte des Jahres 1813. 2 Bände. 1879,	1
II.—1. The War-ships and Navies of the World. By Chief Engineer J. W. King, United States' Navy; late Chief of the Bureau of Engineering. Boston and London: 1880.	
2. The Navies of the World. By Lieutenant E. W. Very, United States' Navy. London: 1880.	
3. Das schwimmende Flottenmaterial der Seemächte. Von J. F. von Kronenfels. Vienna: 1880.	
4. La Marine à l'Exposition Universelle de 1878. Ouvrage publié par ordre de M. le Ministre de la Marine et des Colonies. 2 vols. Paris: 1879, . . .	31
III.—1. Jacques d'Artevelde. Par Kervyn de Lettenhove. Gand: 1863.	
2. Recherche des Antiquitez et Noblesse de Flandres. Par Philippe de l'Espinoy, Vicomte de Thérouenne. Douay: 1632.	
3. Annales de Flandres de P. d'Oudegherst. Par M. Lesbroussart. Gand: 1789.	
4. Korte Levensschets van Jacob van Arteveld. Door Lieven Everwyn. Gent: 1845.	
5. Mémoires sur la ville de Gand. Par le Chevalier Charles-Louis Diericx. Gand: 1814.	
6. Cronijcke van den Lande ende Graefscpe van Vlaenderen. Gemaect door Jor. Nicolaes Despars. Te Brugge: 1839.	
7. Memorie Boek der Stadt Ghent, 1301–1737. Ghent: 1839.	

Contents.

	Page
8. Le Siècle des Artevelde. Par Léon Vanderkindere, Professeur à l'Université de Bruxelles. Bruxelles: 1879,	63
IV.—Endymion. By the Author of 'Lothair.' Three vols. London: 1880,	103
V.—An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion. By John Caird, D.D. Glasgow: 1880,	130
VI.—1. L'Italie actuelle. Lettres à un ami, par Émile de Laveleye. Paris and London: 1880.	
2. I Partiti Politici alle Elezioni Generali dell' anno 1880, appunti di Statistica elettorale. Con Carta grafica. Estratto dall' Archivio di Statistica, anno v. Roma e Torino: 1880,	161
VII.—1. Report of the Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for War to inquire into certain Questions that have arisen with respect to the Militia and the present Brigade Depot System. 1877.	
2. O'Byrne's Collection of Army Circulars. 1867 to 1879.	
3. Premature Enlistment. By Sir E. Sullivan, Bart. 1880.	
4. Ordnance Store Regulations. 1880,	184
VIII.—A Dictionary of Music and Musicians (A.D. 1450–1878), by eminent Writers, English and Foreign, with Illustrations and Woodcuts. Edited by George Grove, D.C.L. London: 1878–1880. (In progress),	212
IX.—History of the Invasion of the Crimea. By A. W. Kinglake. Vol. VI.: 'The Winter Troubles.' Edinburgh: 1880,	241
X.—1. The Land Question, Ireland. No. 1: Notes on the Government Valuation of Land in Ireland. No. 2: Confiscation or Contract. Published by the Irish Land Committee, Dublin: November, 1880.	
2. Parnellism Unveiled; or, the Land and Labour Agitation of 1879–80. By Philip Henry Bagenal, Barrister-at-Law. Dublin: 1880.	
3. The Irish World and American Industrial Liberator. A Journal printed in New York: 1879–1880.	
4. Young Ireland: a Fragment of Irish History, 1840–1850. By Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, K.C.M.G. London: 1880,	274

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
JANUARY, 1881.

No. CCCXIII.

- ART. I.—1. *Mémoires, documents, et écrits divers laissés par le Prince de Metternich, Chancelier de Cour et d'Etat*, publiés par son Fils, le Prince R. DE METTERNICH. Première partie, depuis la Naissance de Metternich jusqu'au Congrès de Vienne, 1773–1815. 2 vols. Paris: 1880.
2. BEER, *Zehn Jahre österreichischer Politik*, 1801–10. 1877.
3. ONCKEN, *Oesterreich und Preussen im Befreiungskriege*. Urkundliche Aufschlüsse über die politische Geschichte des Jahres 1813. 2 Bände. 1879.

THE appearance of the two first volumes of the long expected Memoirs of Prince Metternich has disappointed the public, but we are not sure that this unfavourable impression is not somewhat exaggerated; for although the autobiography in the first volume is historically worthless, it furnishes us with a curious key to the character of a man who played a great part on the world's stage, and the documents and despatches in the second volume are of genuine value and importance. The first thing which must strike every reader who even superficially peruses these pages is the wonderful self-sufficiency of the author, barely stopping short of a claim to infallibility. At the age of scarcely twenty-five he writes from the Congress of Rastadt to his wife (Jan. 1, 1798), 'Tout ce que je prévoyais arrive;' and when after the great catastrophe of 1848 he met in London M. Guizot, who frankly avowed the faults of his policy, the ex-Chancellor declared that he was not aware of having committed a single mistake. 'What is called the *système Metternich*,' he writes, 'was not a system, but the application of the laws which govern the world. Revolutions are founded on systems, the

'eternal laws are outside and above what really has only the value of a system.' The one object, he tells us, of these essays, which he has written as '*Matériaux destinés à servir à l'histoire de mon temps*,' is to prove that he never wavered, that all his life long he followed but one policy, that of justice. The only means to resist the storms of the time, he writes in his preface, is 'for the conscientious man the device which I have made the symbol of my convictions and of those who follow me, "*La vraie force, c'est le droit*;" without that everything is fragile. Happy is the man who can say of himself that he has not swerved from eternal justice. My conscience does not refuse to me this testimony.' He was never ambitious: 'The diplomatic career might certainly tempt my ambition, but all my life I have been inaccessible to this sentiment' (i. 22). 'I was inaccessible to prejudice, and in all matters only sought for truth' (ibid.). 'I never feared to be misled into the false path, into which so many men are carried away by a sickly imagination and still more by self-love, for I felt safe against these faults' (i. 51). He simply obeyed the wishes of his sovereign when he consented to accept office. He tells us little of his first appointment at Dresden, but he gives an exposition of his political principles (i. 30). Politics is the science of the vital interests of states in the most elevated sphere. But what characterises modern society is the tendency to cultivate common interests, on which reposes the guarantee of their existence. The special interests to which commonplace politicians often attach paramount importance have but a secondary value. History shows that as soon as those special interests of a State are preferred to the general interests, this fact must be considered as a malady which leads either to a prompt reaction or to perdition. The modern world is a social body reposing on the principles of Christianity, which, applied to the State, are those of reciprocity, solidarity, equipoise, and good faith, and the infractions of these principles are punished in proportion to their gravity. He therefore scorns the policy of egotism and low ambition, which seeks the Useful outside of the path of justice; and he concludes with the lofty assertion that, resolved as he was to force his way according to his conscience, it is easy to guess what value he attached to politicians like Richelieu, Mazarin, Talleyrand, Canning, Capo d'Istria, Haugwitz, etc. It may certainly be doubted whether the young diplomatic novice was able to appreciate men like Richelieu and Mazarin, but it must be remembered that he wrote these lines in 1844, when he probably had only vague

recollections of what he felt at twenty-eight, and that he never forgot the diplomatic defeats he had sustained from Canning and Capo d'Istria.

His disinterestedness is placed above all doubt, although we see in his letters from Rastadt that he knew perfectly how to combine these elevated feelings with a keen perception of his personal advantage. 'The left bank of the Rhine is irreparably lost, but I have the best-founded hopes that we shall succeed completely as to our indemnities. My position of representative of the (Westphalian) counts is of inappreciable value to me; it enables me to work myself and for myself, and I assure you that I do not lose a minute nor an occasion' (i. 357). 'I have cast my eye on an estate which would unite all advantages, and I have no reason to believe that we might not get it. But in every case we may be perfectly quiet as regards our future' (i. 365). He describes himself as a serious man, despising the frivolities of elegant society, yet his letters from Rastadt show that he greatly appreciated good dinners; he writes with horror about the disgusting *gargote* of the Republican deputies; and as to the female sex, it was not only at the Congress of Vienna that Gentz complained that the love affairs of the Duchess of Sagan occupied him more than affairs of state, for we see him as a young husband keenly enjoying the gay society of French actresses, although he assures us that he always abhorred bad company. The great aim of his life was the struggle against the revolution. 'I felt,' he writes as a student, 'that the revolution would be the adversary which I had to combat,' yet he published in 1794 a pamphlet advocating the arming of the whole population, the *levée en masse* being the only effective means of vanquishing France, a doctrine which he afterwards strongly condemned when he considered the rising of the Tyrolese against the French as a dangerous example, although they fought for Austria; and he denounced as demagogues the Prussian statesmen who introduced universal military service. Prince Metternich complains that contemporaneous biographies misrepresented him, but on the whole we believe that the admirable sketch of the Chancellor in Immermann's celebrated 'Tragedy in Tyrol' resembles him much more than this autobiographic portrait, which reminds us of Ségur's saying, '*La mémoire se plie aux fantaisies de l'amour propre.*'

But we must come to the far more important question, how far these Memoirs are a real contribution to the knowledge of modern history. Memoirs, if not founded on contemporary

diaries, are often a somewhat doubtful source of information, for it requires a prodigious memory to retain even the exact chronology of events, and to reproduce long conversations and intricate negotiations in their concatenation is almost impossible. At any rate, such papers should be written with all the aids which libraries and archives can afford. That Prince Metternich has not taken the trouble to consult them is abundantly proved by Paul Bailleu in an able criticism of this book in Sybel's 'Historische Zeitschrift,' viii. 227.* Thus he says that Kaunitz died in February, 1794, and was replaced by Thugut: in fact that statesman's death only took place in June, but he withdrew from public life in 1792, and he was succeeded first by Cobenzl, who in 1793 was followed by Thugut. Metternich states that he arrived at the University of Strassburg just after young Napoleon had left it, but Napoleon was never an officer in that city, and the story of their having had the same fencing-master there must be a myth. He tells us that he received the news of the loss of the battle of Bautzen by a special messenger on May 29, while Humboldt reports that he communicated it to him in the evening of the 26th.

But what is far more curious is that Metternich, in writing the several papers of which his autobiography is composed, did not even consult his own despatches, and is therefore constantly contradicted by them, as well as by other documents which have been lately published. He says that he has thought it his duty to state how certain important transactions happened about which nothing has been written, except perhaps by Lord Castlereagh, because the presence of the sovereigns during the war of 1813-15 enabled their ministers to report verbally. Yet it is now proved that at several of the most important meetings of the Allied Powers protocols were drawn up, which, though signed by Metternich himself, do not all square with his reports. Thus the whole autobiography adopts the shape of a history written *après-coup*, in order to prove that he has always been walking in the path of justice and has never been mistaken; even the editors of the present memoirs seem not to have been aware of these contradictions, as they pass them over in silence.

We propose now to give a brief sketch of Metternich's

* In one point, however, this acute critic is mistaken, when he impugns Metternich's statement, that in 1792 the students of Mayence used the revolutionary calendar, which, he says, did not exist at that time. But it was introduced in September 1792.

career, in the course of which we shall have occasion to justify these assertions. Born at Coblenz in 1770, where his father was Imperial minister at the three ecclesiastical Rhenish courts, Metternich, after having finished his studies, was appointed successively the representative of the Westphalian counts at the coronations of the Emperors Leopold and Francis II., and envoy at the Congress of Rastadt. He married the daughter of Prince Kaunitz, and in 1801 entered the diplomatic service as minister at Dresden. In 1803 he was appointed minister at the court of Berlin, at that moment a post of great importance. Prussia had remained neutral since the peace of Basle; war seemed imminent when Napoleon collected his forces at the camp of Boulogne; Austria and Russia came to an understanding and wished to win over Prussia. A mission of the Archduke Anton to Berlin had no more success than that of Prince Dolgoruki, the confidential aide-de-camp of the Emperor Alexander; the Prussian army was for war, but the Cabinet, directed by Haugwitz and Lombard, was against risking any decisive step in that direction. Lombard, being in the pay of France, was for a close understanding with the First Consul, which was equally recommended by Marquis Lucchesini, Prussian Minister at Paris. Hardenberg, Minister for Foreign Affairs, inclined to the Russian alliance, though he eventually and reluctantly accepted the French alliance also, but he insisted upon a decided policy in one direction or the other. Unfortunately, the King continually wavered between the two parties; he was bent upon maintaining neutrality, yet wanted the courage to adopt that firm position, which alone could force Napoleon to respect it. 'Il était le plus méthodique et le plus obstiné des irrésolus,' says G. Valbert, in his review of Hardenberg's Memoirs, and he fulfilled the prophecy of Joseph de Maistre, who said that the most dangerous policy for Prussia would be to trifle with both sides, but that, nevertheless, this is what she would probably do. The negotiations with Napoleon proved that he would promise nothing and exact much; yet Haugwitz informed the French Minister that if the *status quo* was maintained, the King would pledge his word never to listen to a plan which might disquiet France.* A month later, however, the sovereigns of Russia and Prussia came to a written understanding, by which they undertook to oppose any fresh encroachment of France upon the states of Northern Germany; and that in case of such an event the Czar would furnish a

corps of 40,000 men for the alliance, and that peace should be re-established only with their common consent. The relations of France and Russia now became very strained, particularly in consequence of Russia's protest against the violent seizure of the Duc d'Enghien on neutral territory, and the respective ministers were withdrawn. Another French act of violence followed in the imprisonment of Mr. Rumbold, the British Minister at Hamburg. Although this was personally offensive to Frederic William III., as Rumbold was equally accredited to himself, he could not make up his mind to take a decisive step; he remonstrated in a letter to Napoleon, whom in the meantime he had acknowledged as Emperor; but he did so without effect. Rumbold was released without his papers being restored. The King was astonished at this result, and thanked the Emperor in a letter of overflowing gratitude. This vacillation could not please at St. Petersburg, and a secret treaty of alliance with Austria was signed (November 6, 1804) between the two Imperial Courts. Metternich, without communicating this treaty, was ordered to invite Prussia to accede to a common system of defence. Hardenberg was in favour of the proposal, and represented to the King that the maintenance of neutrality was impossible, and would reduce the state to isolation, which would place it at the mercy of the victor; that an alliance with France would expose Prussia to the immediate attack of Russia, and that therefore the only advisable alternative was a defensive alliance with the two Eastern Powers. In this critical state of affairs, says Metternich (i. 42), the Emperor Alexander resolved to strike a great blow; in a letter to the King he announced that he had ordered his army to cross the Prussian frontier. Metternich says that he had foreseen the result of this attempt to put pressure (which he qualifies as *conduite téméraire*) on the King, who in fact declared that, resolved to remain neutral, he should consider himself at war with any Power violating his territory. Immediately after this declaration had been given to the Russian Minister, the news arrived that Napoleon had crossed the Prussian neutral territory near Anspach, in order to turn the Austrians at Ulm. The King then declared that matters had changed, that he accepted the interview with the Emperor of Russia, and opened to him the frontiers of his kingdom. Metternich adds that perhaps never within one decisive hour were such considerable events crowded together. Now this report does not at all agree with his despatches. He wrote (September 23, 1804):—

‘The King yields to one feeling, which dominates him and which the men who surround him have always nurtured, that of fear. The

power which inspires here terror will direct the steps of the Prussian Cabinet; this cannot be Austria, which is no more feared, but only France and Russia; the Court of Prussia can only be conquered at St Petersburg. The most intimate union with Russia offers therefore far the best chances of success at Berlin. The King has the greatest confidence in the Emperor Alexander, and if his reason cannot refuse to see the necessity of uniting his views to those of the two Courts, the fear alone of compromising himself with France tortures him; it is only Russia which can overcome it or force him to act notwithstanding it. (December 5.) The Court will declare for Russia, when it will be forced to make its choice. The moment when the Cabinet of St. Petersburg orders its troops to enter Pomerania or advances them towards the frontier will be that when the King will find himself drawn from his lethargy, which he likes best. (February 18, 1805.) Prussia must see that no shift is possible, she must not doubt the impossibility of inaction when these two Powers have resolved to pronounce themselves for the welfare of Europe, she must not only for the moment be driven into a corner, but she must be kept there. (May 16, 1805.) It cannot be denied that the energetic language of Baron Winzingerode has had the effect of intimidating the King, and that the minister has given a positive assurance that the Prussian Court would co-operate with the allied Powers if the moment for action arrived.'

The man who wrote this cannot have disapproved of the threatening language of Alexander as 'a precipitate step of a sovereign always in danger of acting hastily and seeing matters only through the medium of his favourite ideas' (i. 44), 'as an enterprise doomed to failure by the character of the King, whilst after his first interview with the Emperor (Alexander) he abounds in his praise' (October 29). 'Without him,' he says, 'without his final resolution to undertake a painful journey, the result of which might be compromising to his personal dignity, without his generous devotedness, which led him to act as simple negotiator, not to be discouraged by sluggishness and all kinds of mortifications, Prussia would not have moved' (November 4).

The Czar, on his arrival at Potsdam, was struck by the tenacity with which the Prussian Government still clung to the idea of mediation. He endeavoured to give to it the form of an ultimatum, but in vain; the defeat of the Austrians at Ulm had revived the terror of the King, who tried to drag on the negotiations. Lombard had the impudence to pass the evening of the day when the news of Anspach arrived with Laforest and Duroc. Beyme said publicly that the Austrian monarchy was put up to auction, the neighbouring Powers ought to arm in order to take what suited them, and that he saw no objection to Bonaparte establishing one of his brothers

at Vienna. Both tried to thwart the negotiation as much as possible: a despatch of Talleyrand, at once menacing and cajoling, declared the affair of Anspach to be an involuntary error. At last, however, the Emperor Alexander succeeded in bringing about the Tripartite Treaty of November 3, 1805, which Metternich designates as the *ne plus ultra* of what could possibly be obtained. The King promised his armed mediation on certain specified conditions, the result of which was to be either the prompt re-establishment of peace or the accession of Prussia to the Russo-Austrian alliance. But the ultimatum turned out to be a plaintive letter of the King, in which he assured Napoleon that he had remained entirely alien to all the intrigues against France, and implored him to set an example which would be followed by the Emperor of Russia. 'One word from your lips, and you reassume the fair part which placed you both three years ago among the benefactors of humanity' (Hardenberg, ii. 344); and the man charged to present this letter to Napoleon was Haugwitz, of whom the King said that he had chosen him because he had no secret from him, and the Emperor of the French had long known his principles—a passage which Lombard introduced into the letter. Haugwitz delayed his departure as much as possible, and when arrived allowed himself to be put off till after the battle of Austerlitz. Then, in flagrant violation of his instructions, congratulating the Emperor on his victory, he signed a treaty of alliance with France, by which Prussia abandoned Anspach, Baireuth, Clèves and Neufchatel for Hanover, which she had always coveted, and hoped to obtain in a secret article from her allies by way of an exchange for her Westphalian territories. That was the treaty which Lombard in his memoirs calls an unexpected good fortune—the last gift of a clever Minister, who was rewarded with the blackest ingratitude. Anything might, however, be expected from a Minister who, immediately after the signature of the Tripartite Treaty, betrayed it to the French Minister, and answered the reproach of not having prevented the King from taking such engagements—'We could not do otherwise, and you see that I have taken care to make all stipulations so vague as to leave us such latitude that we are not bound to anything. Assure the Emperor that this is only a trick, and that we are and will remain the best friends.' Bailleu impugns the truth of the report, which Laforest himself in 1807 gave to Metternich, by quoting a despatch of the French Minister of November 14 from the archives, according to which he had told Haugwitz that some

Russian gentlemen had asserted the conclusion of a treaty, and that the Prussian Minister had answered that no fresh treaty existed between the two sovereigns, that he had never contradicted the fact that some promise had been given, but had launched into vague phrases about the attempts to bring over the King, who, however, would never do anything against his interests. Yet it is difficult to imagine what interest Laforest in 1807 could have had to tell simply a lie to Metternich, and still more to believe that the latter invented this version, which may be easily explained by assuming that Haugwitz's more ample confessions and assurances were of a later date. However that be, the fault lies not with the Austrian Minister, who, we are bound to say, played a creditable part in his difficult position. He had discerned the hollowness of Prussia's military power, but he saw what services she might render to the good cause, and from that point of view he was the first Austrian statesman who frankly put aside the old jealousy against Prussia. His despatches show his keen contempt of the men who at that time governed the State, but he did all in human power to break the irresolution of the King, and to neutralise his bad councillors; he even foresaw the result when Haugwitz was chosen for that momentous mission, and foretold the consequence of Prussia's isolation:—

‘Bonaparte, pressed to accomplish his work and to checkmate us, needs only to put off the Prussian envoy, to seem to listen to his propositions, and to allure the negotiator notwithstanding the menacing position of the Prussian army, hoping that Prussia's decision will melt away in presence of the danger which would have to be encountered more directly by herself’ (vol. i., p. 75).

Finally, it was not Metternich's fault that his Government had rushed with precipitancy into the Russian alliance before being ready for war, nor was he responsible for the faults of the Austrian generals, which became the pretext for Prussia's subterfuges.

Metternich was now called to a larger field of activity, where only, as he says, his public life began. Napoleon after the peace refused Count Cobenzl as Austrian Ambassador, and designated the man who had been the soul of the league of Berlin against France as the most apt to establish the relations between the two Empires which henceforth he wished for. This idea was probably suggested by Talleyrand, who had in vain counselled moderation after Austerlitz, and now wished at least to be on good terms with Austria; but Napoleon was hardly well inspired when he caused a statesman to be called to the position of Austrian Ambassador whose only aim

was to penetrate the secret of his success and the possibility of vanquishing him. Metternich says that on account of his personal relations to the Emperor Alexander, he would have much preferred the post of St. Petersburg to the arduous task of representing Austria at Paris immediately after the disastrous Peace of Pressburg. Being obliged to yield to the will of his master, he lost no time in studying the line of conduct beset with difficulties which he was to follow. To him Napoleon was the incarnation of the revolution, and Austria the safest guardian of the foundations on which social peace and the political equipoise reposed; he was convinced that, bad as the state of Europe was, it bore in itself the germs of destruction, but the exhausted state of his country made peace necessary, by which it might gather strength for playing a decisive part in one of those coming epochs which always follow great usurpations, and Metternich therefore entered into Talleyrand's ideas, though he took care to inform that Minister in his first interview that friendly relations should never be confounded with submission. Convinced that the first necessity for Austria was to have a well-defined position, he took upon himself to yield after a valiant struggle to most of Napoleon's exactions as to the future Italian frontier, and signed the Peace of Fontainebleau (October 10, 1807), which was ratified by his Government. Now at least, he thought, Napoleon had nothing more to ask from Austria. In this he was mistaken: the Foreign Minister, M. de Champagny, told him that, as England was mistress of the seas, the Emperor, in order to force her to make peace, was resolved to be master of the Continent; that he consequently asked Austria to demand the restoration of the Danish fleet, and to recall her Minister from London. Metternich, seeing that the consequence of a refusal would be war, advised his Court to submit, as did Russia, and only took care to disabuse the new Russian Minister, Count Tolstoy, as to the ultimate intentions of Napoleon. He perfectly discerned from the beginning that the possibility of Austria's regaining her former position depended upon the relations of Russia and France. When he arrived at Paris war with Prussia was imminent. He thinks that the battle of Jena marks the culminating point of Napoleon's career, but that, instead of simply weakening Prussia, making her a member of the Rhenish Confederation, and thus consolidating the vast edifice which he had constructed, he sapped it by the exaggerated conditions of the Peace of Tilsit, concluded under the false idea that Prussia was annihilated. He even says that in 1810 he directed

Napoleon's attention to this fault, who admitted it, but said. 'Que voulez-vous? j'étais lancé, il fallait bien finir l'œuvre commencée;' and he does not forget to add that his view has been justified by the event.

This was certainly true, but his despatches from Paris do not confirm his later observations. He simply calls Prussia a third-class Power, and even in 1810 writes 'La Prusse ne peut plus être comptée au nombre des puissances.' He never appreciated the value of the great Prussian reformers, who saved the monarchy after the disaster; on the contrary, he treated as revolutionists men like Stein, Humboldt, and Scharnhorst.

It is different with his views about the Russo-French alliance, and we think Bailleu's opinion that at first he believed in its feasibility, and only hoped for the death of Napoleon, is contradicted by his despatches. He deplored the blindness of Alexander and Romanzow, and saw from the beginning that the Treaty of Tilsit, although he was imperfectly acquainted with the conversations of the two Sovereigns, could only lead to a new era of war. It is now well known that the partition of Turkey formed the foremost subject of those conversations, and in January 1808 Talleyrand told Metternich that the Emperor had resolved upon it, while his project against India was *du roman*. He invited Austria to be a third party sharing in the spoils. France would take the Morea, the isles of the Archipelago, and Egypt; Austria, Bosnia and Bulgaria; Russia, the Danubian principalities, and, as she possessed the Crimea, she was also to have Constantinople, which otherwise ought to fall to Austria. Metternich objected that the conquest of Turkey would cost 300,000 men, and would not advance civilisation for thirty years. 'I know it,' replied Talleyrand, 'but such considerations do not arrest the Emperor.' Then Metternich came to the conclusion that, not being able to save Turkey, Austria should become a co-partitioning Power, and take care to obtain the largest lot, but that certainly the French would not allow Russia to establish herself at Constantinople. This was undoubtedly true, and we now know from M. Thiers that the possession of that city was the stumbling-block of the whole Russo-French understanding. In a subsequent conversation with Napoleon, Metternich expressed his astonishment that France proposed to destroy an empire, the conservation of which was as important to her as to Austria. The Emperor answered that Austria only wished to maintain the Porte because it had fallen into a state of nullity, but that he was forced to combat the English where he

found them, and that if once the Russians—he corrected himself immediately by saying if once *anyone*—were established at Constantinople, Austria would need the support of France against the Russians, and France that of Austria to counter-balance them; that for the present the partition was not imminent, but that, if it should become so, Austria would not only be admitted, but called upon to take care of her interests. These projects were never realised, and Metternich, who at first believed that the doom of Turkey was sealed, soon suspected the Emperor of not being in earnest, his aim being rather to allure Russia and Austria to remove their armies from the centre of their empires, and to leave these defenceless.

The first ray of hope for Metternich was the Spanish insurrection which broke out in consequence of the infamous trick of Bayonne and the invasion of the Peninsula by the French.

‘The subversion of Spain’ (he wrote, March 30, 1808) is one of those horrible events, one of those great and unfortunately too sterile lessons of the annals of history, which ought to prove to all sovereigns that an irreconcilable foe is not disarmed by capitulation. The quarrel revives, and woe to the Power which, in the deceptive moment of apparent tranquillity, has sacrificed its defensive means to secondary considerations—woe to the sovereign who trusts to the benevolent assurances of the victor. There are existences incompatible with each other: that of the present French Government is so with every other throne of Europe, for who would dare to flatter this mass of crowned prefects, who owe their existence to this France and pay that fragile existence with the blood and gold of their subjects?’*

Metternich discerned that Napoleon could not give up his Spanish enterprise, which would tax all his resources, and opened a new field to England for carrying on her gigantic struggle, to which Austria was not admitted, and that the real aim of the interview at Erfurt, which was represented by Champagny as a ‘*rencontre de deux amis*,’ was to cover the Spanish defeats by a gorgeous international gathering of the ‘*parquet de rois*,’ before whom Talma performed the tragedies

* In his first conversation with Metternich, Napoleon ridiculed the Prince Primate, who asked the restoration of what he calls the German fatherland. ‘I have cut short all this nonsense, Monsieur l’abbé (!), I said. I will tell you my secret: in Germany the small fry would be protected against the great ones, and the great want to govern according to their fancy; now, as I want from the Confederation only men and money, and as it is the great and not the small who can furnish me with both, I leave the first to do what they like, and the latter must settle their affairs as they can’ (vol. i. p. 58).

of Corneille. When, therefore, before leaving for Erfurt, Champagny expressed the wish that Austria should acknowledge the new sovereigns of Spain and Naples, which Russia had already done, Metternich advised his Court to yield at once, in order to gain time for its armaments; to provoke war would be folly, but it could only be avoided by being strong. Napoleon himself by collecting a large army in Silesia forced Austria to take precautions, of which he would complain as soon as it suited him, but while delaying the explosion as much as possible, it was necessary to be prepared for it. Besides, that recognition, although sacrificing the principles on which reposed the legitimate thrones, was but a corollary of the recognition of Napoleon as Emperor, and the polite demand of Champagny was a first proof of weakness. He therefore concluded that Austria and Russia should not leave time to Napoleon to settle the Spanish question, for serious as the resistance was, it would finally be crushed by the weight of the French power. If they did, Napoleon would certainly afterwards turn against them. At Vienna, the Spanish events had excited the greatest indignation, and strengthened the resolution to attempt once more a decisive resistance to the subjugation of all Europe. The Emperor, Archduke Charles, and Count Stadion united in pushing forward the armaments. This could not remain hidden from Napoleon, and at the reception of August 15 he called Metternich to account for it.

We have now three reports on this famous conversation, the first in Metternich's despatch of August 17, the second in that of Count Senfft, the Saxon Envoy, who stood close to both interlocutors, and the third in the Memoirs. Now the latter is greatly at variance with what Metternich wrote immediately after the event. According to the Memoirs,

'Napoleon, with a serious air which marked premeditation, came up to him and said loudly: "Well, Monsieur l'Ambassadeur, what does the Emperor your master want? Does he propose to make me come back to Vienna?" Upon Metternich's calm reply, the Emperor insisted and continued his complaints for half an hour, the Ambassador answering ironically his shallow arguments. After he had left the room, I was surrounded by my colleagues, who congratulated me on the lesson I had given to the Emperor.'

He told Champagny, who tried to hush up the matter, some hours later, that he was glad to have had an opportunity of declaring before all Europe what were the intentions of his Sovereign, and Europe would judge on whose side reason and good right were to be found. The whole report is theatrical,

and presents Metternich as coming triumphantly out of the dispute and silencing his adversaries.

His despatch of the 17th gives a different account.

‘Napoleon during the conversation, which lasted an hour and a quarter, never for a moment raised his voice, and expressed himself in studiously measured terms; he once even laughed and said, “You see how calm I am.” We had the air of gossiping and speaking academically on the immediate interests of two great Powers, touching the intentions, the future and Present most secret relations of all European states; such a conversation, in which the Emperor mooted the question of the partition of Turkey in the presence of her representative, is certainly without example in the annals of diplomacy. Napoleon began by saying: “Well, Austria is arming strongly?” “No, sire, she executes the measures resolved upon since the peace of Pressburg; in doing so she simply follows the example of her neighbours, by whom she cannot be out-rivalled.” The Emperor then alluded to the extraordinary movements of troops in Moravia and Galicia, and to the haste with which a militia was formed: “You thus have given an impulse to public opinion which it will be difficult to arrest. My consul at Trieste has been insulted; this fact would be a sufficient motive for war, if I were bent upon it. I do not want war, the Emperor Francis and all sensible people neither, but I believe we shall have it notwithstanding. An invisible hand is in the game, that of England; Mr. Adair has left Vienna satisfied; you force me to arm equally. You are mistaken in believing that you can frighten me: a war with Austria would be a war to the knife; either you must come to Paris or I must conquer your monarchy. Your armaments are not approved at St. Petersburg; the Emperor Alexander will tell you that you must stop them; you will do so, and then I shall not owe to you the maintenance of the tranquillity of Europe, but to Russia. I shall no more admit you to the settlement of so many questions in which you are interested; I shall come to an understanding with Russia alone, and you will be mere spectators.’

He then accused the Austrian Minister at Constantinople of fomenting discord, and pretended that Austria coveted Servia. Metternich strongly contested these imputations, and insisted that Austria had not opposed to his armies any concentration of troops which might be considered as offensive. Champagny sounding the Ambassador on the impression he had received from this conversation, he answered that he considered it as a new guarantee of peace, to which the Minister assented. Count Tolstoy, whom the Emperor had in vain attempted to draw into the conversation, told Champagny it was impossible that Austria should think of making war both against Russia and France. If she was uneasy, it was because she was surrounded by French armies: ‘withdraw them, we shall place 100,000 men on the borders of Galicia, and will answer for the most perfect tranquillity.’ The next morning

Champagny told Metternich that the Emperor was satisfied that his pacific intentions had been well understood, but that his complaints were well founded, and if the Government was not hostile, yet the alleged facts proved the hatred of the public. 'Ah!' replied Metternich, 'renounce the love of foreign nations; force is never amiable; we have done little evil to the French people, yet we have never pretended to be loved by them. Let us have in this respect also perfect reciprocity; if our governments are united, our subjects will love each other; begin with the one in order to obtain the other.'

This interview was followed by an audience which the Ambassador had at St. Cloud, August 25.

'He repeated, by express order of his master, the pacific intentions of Austria. The reserves would be dismissed by September, five regiments collected near Cracow would be dissolved; no other measure could be revoked because no other had been opposed to the menacing positions which the French armies had assumed. Napoleon replied by asking that they should speak not as Emperor and Ambassador; they were not in presence of a large audience as some days ago, and he would speak with perfect frankness to him as to a man whom he esteemed. He considered the matter as settled: "You are on bad terms with Russia, and you cannot make war against me without her." But war had been imminent, a single bad word might have been the spark to ignite the powder, and he knew perfectly well why Austria armed. She had probably been disquieted by the Spanish affairs, and was afraid that he might deal with her as he had done with the Bourbons. But they were his personal enemies, and could not occupy a throne in Europe at the same time with him; besides he wanted complete tranquillity at his back. Spain, instead of increasing her navy and helping him to force England to make peace, increased her army, which could but serve against him. It was far different with Austria and the house of Lorraine. He complained of the want of cordiality in their respective relations; the Emperor Francis never asked the French Ambassador news of him, the Empress had never yet pronounced his name: "We have treated you personally better than we ought to have done, because we like you, but not the slightest courtesy different from what one has for a Bavarian envoy has been shown to my ambassador at Vienna. See on what terms I am with the Emperor Alexander; we make presents to each other, which do not enrich us, but strengthen the bonds between us."

Metternich observed, that he was sure to receive the order to present the Emperor with some vases, if they could serve to consolidate the good relations between them. Austria demanded no better than to coquet with him, but had not seen the slightest advance upon his part, and had feared to compromise herself by acting without finding reciprocity. The Emperor

took this well, and promised the recall of the French Consul at Trieste, who had caused a squabble by his imprudent language, of which Metternich complained.

We cannot but conclude, that the despatch of the 17th gives the true account of the scene in the diplomatic circle; it is in the main confirmed by the report of Count Senfft, and only on this supposition is the conversation of the 25th intelligible, which, as Metternich says, resembled much more a lovers' quarrel than a discussion between a Sovereign and an Ambassador. But then what becomes of the grandiloquent report of the Memoirs, and of the lesson which he had publicly administered to Napoleon and Champagny?

Metternich justly concluded from these conversations, that Napoleon felt himself obliged to make great exertions against Spain, and that, not caring to avow them, he took the Austrian armaments as a pretext for demanding a fresh conscription. He would be occupied for months on the other side of the Pyrenees, consequently war could not take place before a year. He had caused the Senate to declare that this war was just and founded upon sound policy, but the power of the Senate had but little effect on public opinion. The shallow rhetoricians of 1793 would never prove that this 'generous enterprise' would be the means of forcing England to make peace, nor that a feeble Bourbon on the throne of Spain was more dangerous to France than an indefinite struggle in the Peninsula and the loss of her colonies. On the contrary, Europe would see that the position of Napoleon at home and abroad had suffered terribly in consequence of his hasty and false calculations. It was no longer the French nation which made the war, it was not even the army, but Napoleon alone. The nation, decimated by the annual levies, wanted peace and rest; the generals, enriched by the spoils of war, wanted to enjoy their newly acquired fortune, and not to jeopardise it by the vicissitudes of new adventures. Austria, favoured by this unexpected turn, had recovered strength, maintained her dignity, and, while remaining on terms of perfect courtesy with France, ought to profit by this respite.

Metternich, after having in vain solicited an invitation to accompany Napoleon to Erfurt, who did not like to have so keen an observer at his heels, went afterwards on leave to Vienna, convinced by a conversation with Champagny that the result of the interview of the two sovereigns had by no means answered the intention with which it was undertaken. On his arrival he saw that war was more imminent than he had believed; although the Emperor Francis was as yet undecided as

to the moment of action, the army would be ready to take the field in the beginning of next year. Metternich, in a memoir drawn up at Vienna, tried to calculate the respective forces of both Powers. He started from the point of view that Napoleon could not abandon the war in Spain. Pushed to that enterprise by the perfidious counsels of Murat, who himself coveted the throne, he found himself compelled to maintain his brother upon it, and nepotism was with him nearly as strong as egotism, although he exercised over his brothers infinitely less influence than over the feeble sovereigns whom he had dethroned. The war was for the Spanish people at once dynastic, religious, and commercial; they were indignant at the overthrow of their national dynasty, at the suppression of the religious orders and the pillage of churches, and they resented the probable loss of their colonial empire. The way in which they conducted the war was entirely new to Napoleon, misled by his successes in Germany; he would be obliged to devote to it 200,000 men, and therefore have only 250,000 at his disposal against Austria. The relations of Austria and Russia were cold, and Napoleon wanted to bring them to an open quarrel, in order to be able to concentrate as many troops as possible in Spain. Talleyrand, on the contrary, being opposed to the Spanish war, tried to draw together those two Powers, and was seconded both by Tolstoy and Caulaincourt, the French Ambassador at St. Petersburg. Seeing the Emperor launched upon a path that must lead to destruction, he was not afraid to speak frankly to Alexander at Erfurt. 'Sire,' said he, 'what are you going to do here? It is for you to save Europe, and you will only succeed by resisting Napoleon. The French nation is civilised, its sovereign is not; the sovereign of Russia is civilised, his people is not; therefore the sovereign of Russia must be the ally of the French nation.' And on returning to Paris he expressed his conviction to Metternich, that the French interest itself required that the Powers able to resist should oppose a barrier to Napoleon's insatiable ambition, that only the union of Russia and Austria could save what remained of the independence of Europe, and that Caulaincourt would work together with Schwarzenberg for that purpose. The Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. de Romanzow, who was sent to Paris in order to consolidate the results of the Erfurt interview by a treaty, was, on the contrary, blindly devoted to Napoleon; he taunted Metternich, after his return to Paris, on the awkwardness with which the Emperor Francis tried to put off the recognition of the new kings, and was not even shaken in his

confidence when the Ambassador alluded to the possibility of Napoleon's design to unite on his own head the crowns of Spain and France. 'It would be useless to think of educating a genius such as Napoleon. We must not give him any reason for being dissatisfied, and limit our policy to that object.' He, however, would not believe that Napoleon was planning war against Austria, although he had no answer when Metternich said that peace would never be secured by the union of Russia and France, as long as Austria was excluded from it, as she had been at Erfurt, while her admission would facilitate peace with England.*

Metternich found public opinion in Paris very much excited by the vague news of disasters in Spain and the rumours of Austria's armaments; the inspired press assumed a hostile tone; from Valladolid, Napoleon ordered the princes of the Rhenish Confederation to prepare their contingents; war with Austria was considered certain for the following spring. After his return from the Peninsula, Napoleon studiously avoided speaking to the Ambassador, but declared to the Russian Minister that he was obliged to take decisive measures. The Imperial Guard arrived from the Pyrenees; the most important generals were expected at Paris; Talleyrand and Fouché were publicly insulted by the Emperor and dismissed. The peace of the Dardanelles, concluded between England and the Porte, furnished a new grievance against Austria, although Metternich proved to Champagny that it had been a surprise for her as much as for France, and that the Inter-nuncio had shown the greatest forbearance notwithstanding the provocations of the French Minister. Therefore Metternich justly concluded, that if the Emperor delayed the declaration of war, it was simply because he was not ready for it; meanwhile, in order to gain time, he evidently wished to keep Austria in suspense, and to surprise her by a sudden attack.

In the beginning of March, Napoleon was ready. Metternich's letters were intercepted even before war was declared, his passports were refused, and he was kept as a sort of hostage until the French embassy had returned from Vienna; he only left Paris on May 26, his family remaining there, and on June 5, escorted by a French officer, arrived at Vienna, whither the victorious French army had preceded him. Established in the environs of the capital, he insisted upon

* Napoleon in 1810 admitted that Austria owed the war to Romanzow's feeble policy (vol. ii. p. 329).

considering himself a prisoner, and declined an interview with Napoleon, which Savary proposed to him after the battle of Aspern; he was only released on the 29th, and immediately went to see his master, whom he found calm and firm. Count Stadion, on the contrary, was in low spirits, and considered the situation desperate. Metternich says, that, notwithstanding his intelligence, Stadion was subject to the impressions of the moment, that he now acknowledged that it would have been better to have followed the policy which he (Metternich) had recommended. We are, however, at a loss to perceive in what that policy differed from that of Stadion, except, perhaps, that he always recommended an understanding with Russia, which, with the disposition of Alexander and Romanzow, was impossible. His last despatch from Paris (April 3) breathes war and shows the greatest confidence in a happy issue: 'We are for the first time strong in ourselves.' Stadion resigned, and accused Metternich of having by his despatches contributed more than any one to the war in order to get the portfolio of Foreign Affairs. Metternich positively contradicts that opinion by informing us that when, after the battle of Wagram, the Emperor offered him that office, he declined it, considering himself not fit for such a post, and only accepted it on finding that Count Stadion, whose principal trait was great firmness (?) of character, insisted upon withdrawing at least after the end of the campaign. After the battle of Znaim, Napoleon proposed to negotiate, an offer which Metternich at once discerned not to be sincere and intended only to gain time. This view was soon confirmed, when Napoleon at first refused to have protocols of the sittings drawn up, and then asked Metternich to sign those which he had himself dictated. Seeing this manœuvre thwarted by a blank refusal, he asked the Emperor Francis to send to Vienna Prince Lichtenstein, then commander-in-chief, with whom he would soon settle a question which diplomatists did not understand.* The Emperor sent the prince simply in order to know at last what Napoleon wanted. Metternich warned him that the latter would either compromise him or detain him; but the prince, who was a good soldier but no statesman, was induced by Champagne to sign a draft of treaty 'destined to be brought to the know-

* The correctness of Metternich's views was confirmed by a later conversation with Napoleon, who avowed that if the Austrians in September had recommenced hostilities, he would have been lost, and admitted that even without the renewal of war Metternich would have obtained better conditions than those agreed to by the peace of Vienna (vol. i. p. 101).

‘ledge of the Emperor of Austria.’ Some hours later the guns announced to the capital the conclusion of peace, and when Lichtenstein wanted to remonstrate with Napoleon on this trick, the Emperor had left Schoenbrunn. The Emperor Francis had no choice left but to ratify the treaty, which was thus imposed upon him in violation of the most rudimentary principles of the law of nations.

Metternich, who now officially assumed the reins of the foreign department, says in his Memoirs, that his whole aim was to preserve the kernel which still formed the Austrian Empire, that he never doubted the ultimate ruin to which Napoleon’s boundless ambition was destined, and that therefore his task was to preserve to Austria the chances of regaining whatever the course of events might reserve to his heroic sovereign. He wishes to make us understand, that he, as a firm representative of the old order of things, had always a definite aim in view, and only changed the means of attaining it according to circumstances; that he had never made a pact with the Revolution, when he pleaded the necessity of a close union of Austria with the modern Cæsar, but only wished to preserve to her the possibility of taking advantage of a favourable moment for recovering her position.

It is difficult to adopt his assertion without reserve, and we find in the first important affair of his ministry, the marriage of Napoleon, another striking discrepancy of the Memoirs with contemporary documents. At the end of 1807 Metternich wrote from Paris that the question of the divorce was discussed, and that Fouché had represented to the Empress the necessity of a new alliance, the consolidation of the dynasty requiring that the Emperor should have children. The Empress, hearing that he had no order from her husband for this step, dismissed him haughtily, yet Metternich concluded that he would never have dared to speak in this way unless authorised, and reported that an alliance with the sister of the Emperor Alexander was spoken of, that it was believed this union had been mentioned at Tilsit, that Alexander had not dared to refuse it, but had put off the matter, and that probably Caulaincourt would formally ask the hand of the Grand Duchess. Nothing came of that matter. But it cannot be doubted that, notwithstanding the domestic quarrels, of which Mme. de Rémusat has given us a lively picture, Napoleon was sincerely attached to Josephine; he never forgot what he owed to the Countess Beauharnais at a time when no one could foresee his astonishing career. He had protected her against the intrigues of his family, had crowned her, and even yielded to her wish to have their

union solemnised by Cardinal Fesch the night before the coronation.

But, at the time when Metternich wrote, his resolution to ally himself to one of the sovereign families was probably settled,* and in April, 1808, Napoleon, on a visit to the Archbishop of Bordeaux, opened the question of divorce, and maintained that it was permitted for reasons of State. The contradiction of several ecclesiastics put him into such a state of rage that he forthwith demanded their dismissal. It was after the battle of Wagram, considering the dangers which he had incurred, that he decided to execute his project, in order to strengthen his dynasty. A quarrel with Josephine after his return became the occasion of extorting her consent, which was announced to the family assembled at the Tuileries (Dec. 15). Prince Eugene was compelled to make known his intention to the Senate, which of course nodded assent, although the divorce was formally forbidden to any member of the Imperial family by a decree of March 30, 1806. But who was to be the bride? It was still believed that it would be the Grand Duchess Olga.† Metternich in his *Memoirs* gives the following version of this singular transaction:—

‘There had never been any question of the marriage project either before or after the conclusion of the peace of Vienna. At a masked ball, to which Countess Metternich had been pressingly invited, a mask came up to her whom she at once recognised to be Napoleon, who led her into a distant cabinet and asked her whether the Archduchess Marie Louise would accept his hand and whether her father would sanction such a union. The Countess, much surprised, said that it was

* He said later to Daru : ‘Il faut que je rallie à ma couronne au-dedans et au-dehors ceux qui n’y sont pas encore ralliés. Mon mariage m’en offre les moyens ; il ne doit pas être décidé par des motifs de politique intérieure. Il s’agit de bien autre chose ; il s’agit d’assurer mon influence extérieure et de l’agrandir par une alliance étroite avec un puissant voisin.’ (Haussonville, ‘L’Eglise romaine et le premier Empire,’ vol. iii. p. 221.)

† This princess was recommended by Napoleon’s most intimate friend, Cambacérès, even after the choice of Marie Louise was as good as settled by his master, and for the following reason : ‘I am morally sure, that before two years we shall have war with that one of the two sovereigns whose daughter the Emperor has not married. Now I am not afraid of a war with Austria, but I tremble at a war with Russia. The consequences are incalculable : the Emperor knows the way to Vienna ; I am not so sure that he will find that to St. Petersburg.’ (Haussonville, vol. iii. p. 223.) Napoleon, in his conversations with Fiévée, alludes to the difference of religion : ‘In marrying the Grand Duchess, my carnival would not have been her carnival.’

impossible to her to answer such a question. Napoleon then asked whether she, in the place of the Archduchess, would accept, upon which she replied that she would certainly refuse. "You are *méchante*," said the Emperor; "write to your husband and see what he thinks of it." The Countess refused and told him to address himself to Prince Schwarzenberg, then Austrian Ambassador, whom she forthwith informed of the conversation. The next morning Prince Eugene made the formal demand to Prince Schwarzenberg in the name of the Emperor and with the knowledge of his mother. When a messenger brought this astonishing news to Vienna, Metternich declared to the Emperor that an evasive answer was impossible, and that he, as a sovereign and a father, must decide whether to say yes or no. The Emperor said that his daughter alone could decide; upon which the Archduchess declared, that she begged her father to obey simply his duties as a sovereign and not to make them subordinate to her personal interests.

"The Emperor said that this resolution of his daughter did not astonish him, that he had even expected it, and in the mean time had taken his resolution. His consent would procure some years of rest to the monarchy, which he could devote to healing its wounds. "I owe myself to the happiness of my subjects, and therefore cannot hesitate; send therefore a messenger to Paris to announce that I shall consent to the demand under the formal reserve that on neither side conditions will be made; there are sacrifices which should not be stained by anything resembling a bargain."

"This," Metternich concludes, "is the truth on the marriage of Napoleon with the Archduchess Marie Louise."

Now, this truth turns out to be a romance when we consult the documents.

At the end of December, 1809, Metternich from Vienna informs Schwarzenberg that the French chargé d'affaires has sounded him on a possible family alliance; that if the question should be mooted at Paris, the Emperor authorised him to receive confidentially any communication to that effect; that, however, H.M. would never force his daughter's will, and that she would never consent to a marriage not in accordance with the precepts of the Catholic religion.

"January 3, 1810. The Countess writes to her husband that the Emperor has received her in the most flattering manner and said: "M. de Metternich now occupies the first place of the monarchy; he knows this country well, and can be useful to it." The next morning she was informed that the Empress wished to see her; on arriving, the Queen of Holland said: "You know that we are all Austrian, but you will never guess that my brother had the courage to advise the Emperor to ask for your archduchess." Then the Empress entered, and after having spoken of what she had suffered, she said that she wished for the marriage and had spoken of it to the Emperor, who told her he had not made his choice, but she was sure that he would do so if he

had the certainty of being accepted. The ruin of Austria and of her sovereign was unavoidable in case of a refusal, and this consent was probably the only means of preventing a schism with the Holy See.

‘Metternich answered (January 27) that he saw in the choice of the Emperor the possibility of a pledge for the interests of the nations, which after such terrible sufferings wanted peace, as well as for that of the Emperor. *This consideration has moved me, from the first moment when I was informed of the dissolution of the bonds which united him to a wife who with difficulty will be replaced, to look for the princess who might be called to take that place. The Archduchess must present herself very naturally to my mind first of all.* I found many reasons for it, and I thought it proper *at once to sound the disposition of my master, in order to prevent any hint of a proposal if his consent seemed to me impossible.* I found the Emperor on this occasion as always without prejudice, frank, loyal, strong in principles and in will; I found him sovereign of a vast empire as well as a loving father. *I saw at once that I might make my calculations with confidence,* which fortunately coincide with the wishes of the Empress Josephine. The Archduchess, of course, is ignorant of these views, but our princesses are little accustomed to choose their husbands according to their affections, and the respect for the will of a father makes me hope that a child so good and so well educated will raise no difficulties.’

This letter proves that Metternich had planned the marriage long before he received the first letter of his wife, and that he cannot possibly have believed himself to be ‘*le jouet d’un rêve*’ when M. de Laborde first spoke of it; that if the reported touching conversations between him, the Emperor, and the Archduchess really took place, it must have been before he received the letter of the Countess, for he tells her in his answer that when he conceived the idea he *at once* sounded the Emperor, and gives his first instructions to Schwarzenberg, Dec. 25, while the letter of the Countess is dated Jan. 3. But we have another report proving that Metternich not only discerned the possibility of making his calculations with confidence, but actually offered the Archduchess to Napoleon. M. d’Haussonville (‘*L’Eglise romaine et le premier Empire*,’ iii. 214) tells us that the First Secretary of the Austrian Embassy, M. de Floret, was accosted by M. de Sémonville, the confidential friend of the Duc de Bassano, after the last evening party of Josephine, with the following words: ‘Well, that affair is settled. Why have you not been willing to make it?’ and answered, ‘Who says that we have not been willing?’ ‘It is believed; can it be an error?’ ‘Perhaps.’ ‘What they (*on*) would be disposed; you, perhaps; but the ambassador?’ ‘I can answer for Prince Schwarzenberg.’ ‘But Metternich?’ ‘No difficulty whatever.’ ‘But the Emperor?’ ‘Neither.’

‘ And the Empress, who detests us ? ’ ‘ You do not know her ; she is ambitious, and would consent.’

This conversation was, of course, reported the next morning to the Emperor, whose face lighted up with joy at the first words of Bassano, and who told him that this coincided perfectly with the despatch which he had just received from M. de Narbonne, who, passing through Vienna, had touched the subject of the marriage in his conversations with Metternich and the Emperor, and from the manner in which he was listened to by both had received the impression that the idea of a union with the Archduchess would not be badly taken at Vienna. M. de Laborde, auditor at the Council of State, and well known in the circles of the Austrian aristocracy, was then charged with the negotiation, of which Prince Schwarzenberg was so well informed by several despatches, that when Prince Eugene made the formal demand, he took it upon himself to accept it without asking for further instructions. The reasons of Metternich’s policy are easily explained. He knew that the ‘ terrible sacrifice of the Archduchess,’ as he later called it, would procure Austria at least some years’ rest, while a refusal, or, still more, a family alliance with Russia, would have had disastrous consequences for his country, since in the latter case Bonaparte would have dragged, not only Alexander, but also the French nation, into plans destructive for Austria and the Continent. On the contrary, the Austrian marriage would sow distrust and fear against France in St. Petersburg, and bring Russia by-and-by back to a sounder policy (Oncken, ii. 55). But what can be the value of Memoirs which are in flagrant contradiction to well-established facts ? What must be thought of an author who, professing to re-establish the truth, makes assertions only to be explained by an extraordinary weakness of memory, or by assuming that Napoleon was right when he told Mme. de Rémusat that Metternich was almost a statesman, as he had a rare gift of lying ?

It remains to be mentioned that Metternich wrote to Schwarzenberg (December 25) that H.M. would never consent to a marriage not conformable to the principles of the Catholic religion, but on January 27 he declared that the greatest impediment, that of religion, no longer exists. This was true ; Napoleon did not choose to address himself to the Pope, first because he was on bad terms with him, and then because Pius VII. would have found himself in the following dilemma : either the Empress was not canonically married, in which case he ought not to have crowned her ; or she was married, and in that case divorce was impossible. Cambacérès therefore asked

an ecclesiastical committee to declare that the marriage with Josephine should be declared null *quoad fœdus*, (1) as neither the priest of the parish nor the required witnesses had been present, (2) as the Emperor had not given his consent, and (3) as no deed confirming the marriage existed. The latter assertion was contradicted by Cardinal Fesch stating that he had himself drawn up the certificate and delivered it to the Empress, who, on his advice, refused to part with it even after the divorce; but the tribunal of the diocese thought the first reasons sufficient to declare the marriage null. Now if Metternich was informed of that decision, and if he did not consider it contrary to the precepts of the Catholic religion to annul a marriage for want of form, which had been expressly sanctioned by a general dispensation given by the Pope to Cardinal Fesch, how could he write the following lines in his Memoirs (i. 97)? ‘The question of the divorce did not exist for the Church, and consequently not for the Emperor. Napoleon had contracted a civil marriage under the express condition that this union could be dissolved. This marriage was therefore worthless in the eyes of the Church. If it had been otherwise, there could have been no question of the projected alliance. The dissolution of the pretended first marriage was therefore a simple formality, as required by the French law.’ He thus seems to ignore the religious marriage, without which, however, it was impossible to speak as he did of an ‘invincible impediment,’ and he invents a condition made by Napoleon at the civil marriage, which was not made and could not be made according to French law. We again ask what faith is due to the Memoirs of a statesman who does not shrink from such contradictions?

We might comment upon the extreme pliability to Napoleon’s extravagances which Metternich showed during his visit to Paris in his unsuccessful mediation between the Emperor and the Pope, which is scarcely in accordance with his conservative professions; but our limited space compels us to come to the great crisis in which Napoleon’s fortune foundered. The ominous prediction of Cambacérès was soon to be fulfilled; the Austrian marriage was only a step to a new quarrel with Russia, and the Emperor sounded Metternich, who had come to Paris in order to see what were the further objects of the almighty ruler, and proposed the restoration of the Illyrian provinces for the cession of a corresponding part of Galicia. The Minister answering evasively, Napoleon said that the refusal of Austria to recognise King Joseph had caused him to promise at Erfurt that he would not oppose the annexation

of the Danubian principalities by Russia, but that he had expressly stated that she should never pass the Danube; Serbia ought to belong to Austria, or to be under her protectorate; he would never suffer a Russian protectorate, for a single place on the right bank in her hands would be tantamount to the conquest of Constantinople. Besides, the conquest of the Principalities, which were of more importance to Austria than to Russia, would form the basis of an Austro-French alliance—an alliance founded on common interests, the sole lasting one. After the news of fresh Russian successes, the Emperor was convinced that the Porte would be compelled to make peace. ‘You must endeavour,’ he said, ‘to repair your losses; the moment has arrived; the loss of the Danube is odious to you.’ Metternich did not deny that the river was of paramount importance for Austrian commerce. Belgrade, which the Emperor offered him, would be certainly useful, but its occupation would hasten the ruin of the Porte; the restoration of the Adriatic provinces would be more important to Austria. From his conversations, and the readiness of Napoleon to cancel the secret article of the Peace of Vienna, which limited the Austrian army to 140,000 men, he drew the following conclusions. The peace between the Russians and the Porte is most unwelcome to the Emperor, because it will set free the Russian army, and thus make that Power more independent of him. He is not ready for war, but will prepare it in 1811, being unable to prevent the annexation of the Principalities after the engagement he had taken at Erfurt (and already announced by an Imperial ukase); he therefore begins to quarrel with Russia about Poland and Sweden, and recalls his ambassador from St. Petersburg, who is, as he says, spoiled by Russian flatteries. The war will take place in 1812; we must be prepared for it. There can be no question of an alliance with Russia, which formerly would have saved us, but of which we should now be the victims. Our interest is to oppose the usurpations of Russia, made at the cost of our best neighbour. If we could save the left bank of the Danube, I would agree to make common cause with France, but without it I would not make war against Russia with the Porte as sole ally. I do not believe that Napoleon is sincere in offering us Belgrade and the protectorate of Serbia, but we may offer our mediation to the Porte, and place Serbia under our more direct influence. We must be ready to have an imposing force; our position must be that of armed neutrality; the result of the eccentric enterprise of Napoleon will decide our further action. He nurtures great illusions in

believing that the Emperor Alexander will either avoid war or make peace after the first defeats. He does not know the character of the Czar, whom he calls a child, and takes no account of the immense extent of his dominions.* In any case, Austria has in such a war a flank position, which will allow her to make her voice heard during and after the struggle.

This programme Metternich submitted to his sovereign with one modification. Russia had in the meantime declared that she would never give up the Principalities, but would not pass the Danube; the Austrian Minister, therefore, concluded that an active alliance with destructive France would be contrary to the most sacred principles which Austria represented, and would degrade her to the position of the Germanic Confederates. It was therefore out of the question unless imposed by absolute necessity. If this could be avoided and war was declared, Austria should seize the first favourable opportunity to negotiate for the cession of a part of Galicia to be united to Poland, the restoration of which Napoleon meditated in exchange for the Illyrian provinces, Salzburg, and part of Silesia, this compensation, however, being conditional and dependent upon the dismemberment of Prussia, which would probably be the inevitable consequence of the war! 'In that case this province, which by its situation would suit us, and in case of the restoration of Poland would be almost absolutely necessary for us, as it offers the only compensation for Galicia, should belong to us.'† The Emperor approved of the proposed policy, which certainly, as the event showed, proves the rare perspicacity with which his Minister penetrated the future course of affairs, except the fate reserved for Prussia. He was mistaken in another point, the conditions under which Napoleon would consent to Austria's neutrality.

The Emperor asked an active support of 40,000 men (afterwards reduced to 30,000), but commanded by an Austrian general, who was to receive orders only from himself; on these terms only would he consent to consider as Austrian

* This confidence was shaken by the war, for Oct. 5, 1812, he writes to Hardenberg, that he considers the entry of Napoleon in Moscow as the first defeat of Russia, which will annihilate her European position. The fact is, that Alexander only at last resorted to that strategy, which he ought to have followed from the beginning. (Oncken, ii. 92.)

† In 1813 the French Minister at Berlin gave a hint to Hardenberg of Austria coveting Silesia. Metternich protested against this insinuation, but in very vague terms. (Oncken, ii. 114.)

provinces the Danubian principalities and Servia, and would be ready to guarantee Galicia or to exchange it for Illyria; the question of Silesia was to be reserved. It would be decided if Prussia committed the least fault. If she persevered in the French alliance, she might cede Silesia to Austria for another German province. It was but natural that with such ultimate projects Austria declined the attempts of Prussia to come to an understanding with her, although Metternich observes that during the war the greatest cordiality existed between the two cabinets. Nor was Metternich, after the disasters of France, disposed at once to cast in his lot with Russia and Prussia. Austria's neutrality, although she was obliged to furnish her contingent, which, by a verbal understanding with Russia, remained passive in Galicia, was acknowledged by both belligerents. She now passed into a state of armed mediation, by which she was sure to throw her weight into the scale, and yet preserve her liberty of action.

After the battles of Lutzen and Bautzen, Metternich saw that the moment for intervention had come; in order to arrest Napoleon, and to prevent Alexander from withdrawing to Russia, he wrote to inform the latter that if Austria's mediation was declined, she would pass into the camp of the allies, and then proceeded to see the Emperor of the French at Dresden. We cannot reproduce here the report of this celebrated interview, which lasted nine hours and decided the fate of the war. It must be read *in extenso*. The violence which Napoleon displayed convinced Metternich of the Emperor's difficulties, but also of his blind stubbornness, for he believed that to yield was to lose his crown, and therefore refused to cede an inch of territory. The mediation was finally accepted, but nothing came of it, as the French plenipotentiaries at Prague found themselves without the full powers without which Metternich refused to negotiate. When at last they arrived it was too late. Austria had passed over to the allies; in fact, both parties had only negotiated in order to gain time.

It would lead us too far to enter into the details of the two eventful years 1813-15, of which Oncken has given an excellent and trustworthy account; we will only mention the principal features of Metternich's part in them. His leading idea was, let us not exchange French for Russian supremacy, but establish an equipoise between the great Powers. A solid peace is only possible if France withdraws within the limits of the Rhine, the Alps, and the Pyrenees; but Russia also must be reduced to the frontiers she had before Tilsit, and restore to the Porte the territory ceded by the peace of Bukarest. An

alliance of Austria with Prussia against the overbearing influence of Russia in Germany is necessary; both must be restored to their former power. The old German Empire is dead and cannot be revived; its members having become sovereign can only be united by a federal bond. For the success of this plan he thought it advisable to maintain the Napoleonic dynasty, but as its founder would never have submitted to a humiliating peace, to establish the regency of Marie Louise for the King of Rome, he was therefore opposed to the restoration of the Bourbons, backed only by a feeble party, as well as to Alexander's project of giving France the choice of her ruler. Metternich lost no time in securing to Austria the principal advantages which he wanted to obtain; he concluded at Prague a secret treaty with Russia and Prussia (July 27), to which England acceded (August 23), and by which he secured for Austria (1) the distribution of the territories known by the name of kingdom of Italy, with the exception of the former possessions of the King of Sardinia, and those which remained to the Pope after the Treaty of Tolentino, maintaining that Austria had an unquestionable right over the legations as King of Rome (?), as well as hereditary Emperor and Chief of the Germanic body (?!); (2) the acquisition of the Illyrian provinces in exchange for the Austrian part of Poland, to be ceded to the Emperor of Russia as King of Poland, and for Austrian Silesia to be ceded to Prussia.*

This prize Metternich secured before a single Austrian soldier had taken part in the war, and at the same time, without even asking Prussia, concluded the treaties with Bavaria and Würtemberg, which left to them their present territories, except those belonging formerly to Austria. The treaty reveals the idea upon which he afterwards managed to found the work of the Congress of Vienna, the supremacy of Austria in Germany and Italy, but we do not find a word of this in his Memoirs, which profess to give the key to what is not to be found in the official documents.

Nevertheless during the war there were constant discrepancies of opinion between Metternich and the Emperor Alexander, pushed forward by the Prussian statesmen, whom the

* The history of this treaty is still unknown, and its text has not been found in the archives of Vienna and Berlin, nor in the British Record Office. We know the above-mentioned details only by a note addressed by Metternich to Lord Castlereagh, Paris, May 26, 1814, and published in Bianchi, *Storia documentata della diplomazia Europea in Italia*, 1814-61, vol. i. p. 333.

Austrian Minister never loses an opportunity to denounce as revolutionists. Stein, Humboldt, Blücher were for pushing on the war until Paris had been occupied. Alexander wished to give France the choice of her future ruler. Metternich vigorously resisted this plan, the execution of which, as he said, would either unfetter the Revolution or, in the presence of the allied armies, would not be accepted by the nation as a free decision. He knew that peace with Napoleon was impossible; seeing that a regency with the King of Rome had become impracticable, he decided for the restoration of the Bourbons, but wished not to irritate France; he therefore launched a manifesto, in which Napoleon at once recognised his hand, proclaiming as the future French frontiers the Rhine, the Alps, and the Pyrenees.

The different aims which the two leading statesmen pursued could not fail to produce animated discussions, which more than once threatened to break up the coalition. Metternich, who, however, in his report confounds the negotiations of Langres with those of Troyes, at last gave up his resistance to the march on Paris, while Alexander acquiesced in the restoration of the Bourbons and the frontiers of 1792 for France. He, however, imposed upon Austria the treaty which, after the occupation of Paris, left to Napoleon the Isle of Elba; Metternich in signing it declared that in less than two years it would bring the allies back to the battlefield. At six o'clock in the morning of March 7, 1815, he received the despatch announcing that Napoleon had escaped from Elba; before ten the four Powers had given orders to their armies for the new campaign, which was terminated by Waterloo.

We must come to a conclusion of the account which we have given of these remarkable volumes. They are shortly to be followed by two more, which will open another page of modern history. We have shown how little value they have for the historian, who would be misled if they had been published before we were able to confront them with other documents. Metternich's intention, when writing these *Memoirs*, to establish his position as the unwavering champion of right and as an infallible statesman, has signally failed; the man who coveted the Legations and Silesia, while giving assurances of perfect friendship to Prussia, never knew any other motive than his own interests. We do not reproach him with being guided by this mainspring of his policy, but for the mask by which he covered it. He was a cool-headed and far-seeing politician, but with all the cunning of the eighteenth century, and a remarkable predilection for temporising. He was no states-

man in the largest sense of the word, for his hatred of the Revolution made him overlook the truth of the saying, 'On ne détruit que ce que l'on remplace;' nations were to him simply aggregations of so many human beings, to be distributed according to the pleasure of kings and ministers. He was certainly the only statesman of his time who clearly discerned the dangers of the Russian Eastern policy for Austria and for Europe, but he never dared to oppose it actively, either as regards Poland or Turkey, and was not able to do so after he had accepted his share in the spoils of Italy. Events have proved that this embarrassed his later policy; his fear of weakening Austria's domination in Italy and Germany led him always to yield to Russia's encroachments, yet the result was the loss of both positions after immense sacrifices. He boasts that the treaties of 1815, with all their faults, did at least secure forty years' rest for Europe, and even weathered the storm of 1848; the fact cannot be denied, but we must say that this interval of rest was not the result of far-seeing statesmanship in 1815, but of imperious necessity dictated by the exhaustion of the Continent, and by the wisdom of such statesmen as Lord Palmerston, who took care to modify stipulations which had not answered the purpose, such as the union of Holland and Belgium, and yet had the firmness to withstand the lust of conquest of France in 1831, and of Russia in 1853.

ART. II.—1. *The War-ships and Navies of the World.*

By Chief Engineer J. W. KING, United States' Navy; late Chief of the Bureau of Engineering. Boston and London: 1880.

2. *The Navies of the World.* By Lieutenant E. W. VERY, United States' Navy. London: 1880.

3. *Das schwimmende Flottenmaterial der Seemächte.* Von J. F. VON KRONENFELS. Vienna: 1880.

4. *La Marine à l'Exposition Universelle de 1878.* Ouvrage publié par ordre de M. le Ministre de la Marine et des Colonies. 2 vols. Paris: 1879.

WE wish to call attention to the origin, or at least to the avowed and responsible authorship, of the above works. Not one of them has been written or compiled by an Englishman. Notwithstanding the surpassing importance which—in this country of all others—we may well believe to belong to

everything connected with our own navy or with those of foreign States; notwithstanding even the fact that certainly a large, possibly the larger, portion of these books has been derived from English sources, such as technical, or even the ordinary journals, it has remained for officers of foreign services to prepare comprehensive descriptions of those forces in the strength and progress of which we Englishmen are chiefly concerned. We believe we are right in saying that, since the publication of Sir E. J. Reed's work on 'Our Ironclad Ships,' which came out more than a dozen years ago, not a single important book on the condition of our own naval *matériel* and that of other maritime Powers has proceeded from an English pen. Of course we are leaving out of consideration some few slight and imperfect sketches, which were, perhaps, not intended to have more than a temporary and very short-lived value; as also works of a thoroughly technical character, like those on naval architecture, for example. There is a remarkable contrast between this literary inattention to the naval affairs of ourselves and our neighbours, and the immense activity which has been shown by writers in this country on army matters and in foreign countries both on such subjects and on those which relate to the navy. We might have added to those at the head of this article the titles of several books in all of which much information about the sea forces of the world may be found; but every one of them would have been the work of a foreign author.

This is particularly surprising at the present time. As Mr. King says, 'Within the last few years all the navies of Europe have been undergoing reconstruction, while those of Asia and South America have been in a great measure created.' Of course our own country has taken no inconsiderable part in this, not only with respect to that force which sails beneath our own flag, but also, by the skill and enterprise of its ship-builders, engine-makers, gun-makers, and armour-plate manufacturers, those of nearly all other States. This condition of things is unfortunate. If it does not exhibit the want of a proper desire to gain knowledge concerning the strength of our neighbours, it at all events seems to show a considerable absence of energy and intelligence in endeavouring to supply it. We are stating what we believe no one can dispute, when we say that there is no book in existence in which an English naval officer can find a detailed description even of his own ships—of the very one in which he may happen to serve, still less of foreign vessels with which he may be in company, in the Adriatic

perhaps—except such as have been compiled by foreigners or published by foreign Governments. Our naval service is evidently without the very rudiments of an Intelligence Department.

Of all the works on our list, Mr. King's is by far the most interesting and important. The others we may very shortly dismiss; his we shall follow throughout our endeavour to exhibit the naval condition of the world at large. Lieutenant Very's volume covers pretty much the same ground as Mr. King's; it is, however, much more concise, and the plans of ships which it contains are almost too rude in many instances to convey an exact idea of the vessels which they are intended to represent. The greater part is apparently a mere translation of some such work as the German '*Marine Almanac*,' the metric figures of which are converted into English equivalents. Its statistics differ widely from those in most of the authorities which we have had occasion to compare it with; so much and so often, indeed, that it would be interesting to know whence Lieutenant Very obtained many of his figures. The Austrian '*Das schwimmende Flottenmaterial*' is a highly meritorious book, profusely illustrated with beautiful and generally perfectly accurate drawings of most of the important war-ships of the world. It deals, however, only with ships, and in it there is no account of the other important items which make up a navy, and for which we must turn to Mr. King. '*La Marine à l'Exposition de 1878*' is an official account of the objects exhibited in the Maritime Section of the Exhibition at Paris, drawn up by a committee of naval and marine officers and constructors appointed by the Government. It contains full descriptions of several French men-of-war.

Mr. King's book, in intention at least, is thoroughly comprehensive. He first describes, country by country, down to the smaller South American States and China, the most important armoured and cruising ships of each navy; he then discusses modern naval ordnance, and the progress made of late in the armament and armour of vessels of war; and devotes separate chapters to the consideration of marine engines, boilers, torpedoes, and torpedo warfare. A great deal of the work, as the author himself states, is derived from English sources, principally the professional newspapers published here. Indeed, he has transferred whole pages to his book from the authorities on whom he has relied; and in quoting ostensibly from him, we may frequently be merely repeating what has

appeared on a previous occasion in some English publication. He has shown great skill and judgment in his selection of materials. Occasionally, indeed, he is led into some curious mistakes. For example, he repeatedly translates the French word *ingénieur*, the equivalent of our 'naval constructor,' by 'engineer,' notwithstanding that that term in our service, as well as in that to which Mr. King belongs, is used in the restricted sense of an officer whose duties are connected with the steam machinery. This is an error of importance in a professional work. He also twice states that Lord St. Vincent's victory, off the Cape from which he took his title, was gained over the French instead of over the Spaniards. There are some obvious inaccuracies in his statement of the cost of certain ships, though as a rule in this particular he is seldom, we believe, very wrong. His spelling of French names is very often incorrect.

Some time ago, a book by Mr. King, of which the present work is a continuation and amplification, was noticed in this Journal. The favourable opinion expressed of it is equally deserved by his later production. His qualifications for compiling it are undoubtedly considerable. He has had thirty-six years' experience in the American Navy, and has held several important posts, both as inspector of steam machinery and as superintendent of the construction of an important class of men-of-war. In addition to this he was sent by his Government on several tours of inspection abroad, expressly to observe the progress that was being made in naval *matériel*. On the reports which, as a consequence, he rendered on his return home, both his former and present works are founded. Until some Englishman takes up the subject—for, good as Mr. King's book is, there is, we venture to think, still a great deal to be done—we know of no guide which can be so safely followed by an inquirer into the naval strength of States as himself.

The idea of protecting ships of war by armour is older than is usually supposed. In the sixteenth century the Knights of St. John had one the sides of which were sheathed with lead. In the great siege of Gibraltar the Spaniards, acting on the advice of a French engineer, constructed floating batteries which, if not covered with armour, had their engaged sides specially thickened to resist the impact of shot. In 1842, Mr. Stevens, of New Jersey, began the construction of an iron-plated battery, still, we believe, unfinished, and the cause, as we have heard, of a singular suit just instituted. At his

death the designer left it to the State of New Jersey on certain conditions. When armoured ships began to form an effective portion of fleets, an inspection of the vessel proved her to be unsuited for the American service; and the trustees endeavoured to sell her. But whenever there was an active demand for armour-clads, it was sure to be at a time when the neutrality laws of the United States forbade the sale of them to a foreign Government. When the law ceased to be an obstacle, the demand had subsided, and the maintenance of an ironclad unsaleable abroad and useless at home proved so onerous to the trustees that they have been led to plead for authority to break her up. It was in 1855, however, that the modern armoured ship of war first really made her appearance in the navies of the world. Exactly a quarter of a century has therefore elapsed since that really momentous epoch. The work of improving the offensive and defensive powers of ships has gone on merrily since, and is proceeding more actively than ever just now.

‘Never,’ says Mr. King, ‘has there been a period, in time of peace, when such large expenditures were being made for naval purposes as at present, and never a period in the history of steam-screw navigation when such radical changes were being effected in the construction of ships of war, in the mechanism of steam propulsion, and in the application of machinery to various purposes on board ship hitherto accomplished by hand.’

Let us attempt to form some estimate of what all this vast expenditure of money and ingenuity has resulted in producing.

The *matériel* of modern navies is divided into—armoured fighting ships of several classes, unarmoured cruisers and gunboats, torpedo vessels, and dockyards or establishments for the construction and repair of those ships. Besides these, there are the weapons—the gun, the ram of the ship herself, the torpedo in its several kinds, and that newest of all naval arms, the *mitrailleuse*, or machine gun. The acquisition of an ironclad now appears to be regarded by nations, or their Governments, as a badge of respectability, as in social life the possession of a gig is supposed to be by certain classes. On no other theory is it easy to understand why Greece should require two such craft, and Portugal one, or even Japan three. The possession of one or two of these expensive engines of warfare is not likely to frighten off a dangerous enemy who counts them by the dozen; and less formidable enemies may most probably be intimidated by less costly means. At any rate, as nearly all

States that have any pretensions to be considered of maritime importance have them, we may give a hasty glance at the most powerful and most recently designed ships of the kind, first those belonging to foreigners, and then those belonging to ourselves.

Formerly, down certainly to Nelson's time, the French naval architects were to us what those of Carthage were to ancient Rome. They taught us how to build ships of war. Since then there has been, as Mr. King notes, a great change. We have made vast strides in advance and have secured great results; whilst the French have 'been compelled to assume 'the attitude of critical observers, if not of careful imitators, of 'other nations.' The large armoured fleet got together by France in the days of the Second Empire was composed chiefly of wooden vessels, which have already begun to lose all importance as fighting machines. The earliest British ships, such as the 'Warrior,' are after twenty years' service sound and in good order, at least as far as their hulls are concerned. France was practically being left without an armoured fleet. Her Government had the wisdom and courage to look the situation fairly in the face, and in 1872 drew up a programme of reconstruction of the fleet. The cost, as first proposed, was estimated at nineteen millions and a quarter sterling; but so rapid has the advance of naval science been of late years, that in 1876 it was found that just twenty-five millions would be required. It would be difficult to produce more convincing proof of the real extravagance of constructing a fleet in the first place of cheap 'make-shifts,' or of the true economy of our own Admiralty in from the earliest engaging in a wise expenditure on durable materials. The programme in its general features was closely adhered to. It provided for the construction or completion of twenty-eight sea-going and twenty coast-service armour-clads, all with hulls of iron or steel, and for thirty-four rapid cruisers of the modern type, several with iron wood-coated hulls, imitated from English designs.

The largest ship in the French service is the 'Amiral Duperré,' of 10,322 * tons displacement and 7,397 horse-power.

* We give Mr. King's figures except where he is plainly in error. Other accounts make the 'Amiral Duperré' of 10,487 tons displacement. Mr. King says 'that much difficulty has been experienced in 'securing the correct figures and dimensions of French ships of war, 'mainly on account of the discrepancies found to exist between publications.' Those who have made inquiries similar to his will agree with him.

She is of a type hitherto almost unknown, and may perhaps be described as a combination of the belted cruiser, of which we borrowed the design from Russia for our own 'Shannon' and 'Northampton,' and the heavy modern battle-ship. She is armoured at the water-line from stem to stern with a belt of iron 21·6 inches thick in its stoutest parts, though reduced in places to 12 inches. Level with the upper edge of this belt is an armoured or thick iron deck. Guns of moderate weight, entirely unprotected by armour, are mounted on the main deck, whilst above the upper deck rise four fixed, open-topped *barbette* turrets, two on the centre line in the after part, and one on each side—these two joined by a double continuous wall of armour across the deck—in the fore part of the ship. In each turret on a revolving turn-table is to be mounted a breech-loading gun of 48 tons. Compared with the Italian 'Dandolo' and 'Duilio,' which she almost exactly equals in displacement, it appears that the 'Amiral Duperré' has 48-ton guns against 100-ton, and a speed of 14·5 knots against 15. On the other hand, she has fourteen light broad-side ($2\frac{1}{2}$ -ton) guns, and is full rigged; whilst the Italian ships have only their turret guns, and are mastless. The French claim considerable advantages for their *barbette* turrets; but in these days of accurate shooting and powerful machine guns, it looks as though the disadvantages more than counterbalanced them.

The 'Dévastation,' built, like the preceding, largely of steel, was launched in the year 1879. She is 1,000 tons smaller. Her armour covers the water-line and a central casemate, in which are mounted four heavy guns, each having a wide arc of fire. The 'Redoutable,' 800 tons smaller, closely resembles her in design. Her water-line armour is 14 inches at the thickest part, that of the 'Dévastation' being 15 inches. Both ships carry eight heavy guns in and outside their central casemate. Of the ships still a long way from completion it is believed that the 'Amiral Baudin' and 'Formidable' resemble the 'Amiral Duperré' in design, and the 'Fou-droyant' the 'Dévastation.' The remaining first-class battle ships have hulls of wood, and of course must soon be replaced. The 'Duguesclin' is the type of the new armoured sea-going ships of the second class. In design she resembles the 'Amiral Duperré,' her armour and armament being similarly disposed. The displacement of this ship is 5,789 tons, the horse-power 4,043, the speed 14 knots, and the thickest water-line armour 10 inches. She carries four $9\frac{1}{2}$ -inch guns in her *barbette* turrets, one $7\frac{1}{2}$ -inch gun on the

forecastle, and six light pieces on the unarmoured maindeck. Her hull is of steel; and three sister ships, or vessels of the same class and of the same material, are being built. The steel hull of the 'Duguesclin' is cased with wood, as are those of some English armoured and unarmoured cruisers.

The 'Tonnerre' is the representative of the new coast-service turret ships of the first class, of which seven are completed and building. The hulls are of iron and steel. They have a single revolving turret, which the French have at length, after long hesitation, adopted for considerable classes of their fleet. This turret is placed above the armoured breastwork or plated citadel rising above the rest of the hull. This is another palpable copy from English designs, and one, we may believe, somewhat spoiled in the transfer. The weakest form of the turret armament is that of the single turret, as we think was conclusively shown in the 'Huascar's' final action with two antagonists, at only one of which she could direct a shot at a time. Strangely enough, we seem to be about to adopt this form of it, as well as the *barbette* plan, for some of our newest vessels, as we shall see hereafter. The second-class coast-service vessels, represented by the 'Tempête,' two sisters of which are being built, are similar to those of the first class in everything but size. It is worthy of note that the method of rotating the turrets of these vessels, as well as of loading the guns of some of the *barbette* ships, is by hydraulic machinery, on the plan of Mr. George Rendel of Elswick.

The French have also busied themselves in producing a formidable squadron of unarmoured cruisers. Four iron vessels of the largest class, sheathed with wood in imitation of our 'Inconstant' and others, have been completed or begun. Two of these, finished or nearly ready, the 'Duquesne' and the 'Tourville,' are alike. The 'Duquesne' is of 5,350 tons displacement, 5,917 indicated horse-power, can steam 15·9 knots an hour, and carries seven 7½-inch and fourteen 5½-inch guns. The 'Tourville' has more horse-power, and is credited with a speed of nearly 17 knots. In other respects the two ships are the same. Speaking of the 'Tourville,' Mr. King says :—

'The space occupied by the engines is greater than that occupied by the engines of any single-screw ship we have knowledge of, and the numerous parts and multitudinous connexions make the complication great, and will cause serious difficulty with the operation of the machinery if it does not result in other evils: besides which the boilers are of the discarded type, and cannot be worked to the pressure necessary to

obtain the economy resulting from the compound system.' He adds : 'The engines can never be run at the maximum speed without risk of a break-down.'

The 'Duguay-Trouin,' of 3,140 tons, and 3,722 horse-power, represents the next class of cruisers. Her speed is put at 15 knots. Altogether of all classes there are twenty-five cruisers of the newer type on the list of the French navy, several of which are not yet launched: The great feature of ships of the kind is, of course, their speed, and it is interesting to find Mr. King asserting 'that the speeds of French ships 'must be over-rated when compared with the English ships of 'equal displacement and engine-power.'

From what has been stated, it will have been perceived that the French navy is again becoming a formidable force, and that a very important part of it is the unarmoured cruising section last mentioned. To man it there are 36,670 seamen; the total, including officers, artificers, boys, &c., is given as 42,670. As in England, so in France, much money has of late years been spent in improving and extending the national dockyards. As the size of ships increased, so the dimensions of dry docks and basins had to be added to, that they might receive the former. Cherbourg, which the French patiently spent fifty-five years in completing and fortifying against attack from the land side, appears, in these days of armoured ships and long-range guns, to be more than ever exposed to one from seaward.

The French claim, and to them may certainly be conceded, the second place amongst maritime Powers. To whom the next should be assigned is not quite so clear. Germany, who at one time seemed to dispute the second place with France, has of late lost ground in comparison with her rival; and may not unfairly be ranked next to, and not before, Italy. That country possesses, or is hastening to complete, the four most powerful ships in the world. One has actually been tried; one was launched in 1878, and is being fitted; a third was launched a few weeks since, and the fourth is still on the stocks of a private company at Leghorn, and is not yet half finished. Two of these, the 'Duilio' and 'Dandolo,' are turret ships, closely resembling our own 'Inflexible.' In the centre of a huge unarmoured hull is a comparatively small portion thickly plated, on top of which, placed in échelon so that their guns may be fired ahead and astern, are the two turrets. So small a part of vessels of the kind is covered with armour-plating, that it has been proposed on high authority to call them—not armour-clads, but 'protected' ships. Of 10,400 tons displace-

ment, they are about the same size as the French 'Amiral Duperré,' but 1,000 tons smaller than the British 'Inflexible,' and 400 smaller than the 'Dreadnought.' Notwithstanding this, they each carry much heavier guns than either of those three ships. Their horse-power falls a little short of 8,000, and their speed is 15 knots. Their side-armour is 21·65 inches thick at the water-line; on the turrets it is 17 $\frac{3}{4}$ inches. Immense as these ships are, they are considerably smaller than the other two—the 'Italia' and 'Lepanto.' These monsters are nearly 13,500 tons, and their engines, says Mr. King, 'ought to develop an indicated horse-power of not less than 15,000, and a speed of 16 knots per hour at sea—a greater power than ever before placed in a single vessel, and a speed greater than ever attained by any war vessel afloat, the "Iris" and "Mercury" excepted.' Like the two turret ships just mentioned, these vessels are to carry four 100-ton guns—made in this country by Sir William Armstrong & Co.—not in turrets, however, but in an oblong *barbette* battery placed diagonally across the line of the keel on the upper deck. The quantity of vertical armour they carry is, relatively, strikingly small, being confined to the sides of this oblong battery, where it is 27 $\frac{1}{2}$ inches thick.

There can be no doubt that the possession of these four gigantic and heavily armed craft adds immensely to the naval importance of Italy. To any naval Power in the world the question relative to her alliance or hostility—especially where there might be other parties to the struggle—would be one of serious moment. Still the policy of building such enormous constructions is one of very doubtful wisdom. The 'Duilio' and 'Dandolo,' without their armament, are said to have cost 700,000*l.* each; and the 'Italia' and 'Lepanto' each 767,000*l.*; whilst the cost of our 'Thunderer' is given at 325,000*l.* Independently of serious tactical defects in the design of the new *barbette* ships, the mere size and costliness of any one of the four Italian armour-clads may make us ask if the money required for her would not have been more prudently spent in, at all events, two vessels of more restricted dimensions. That this feeling is growing up in Italy we believe to be shown by a recent statement of the Minister of Marine, that no more such large ships would be built, and by the published opinions of Italian naval officers, that a return to more moderate displacements and less heavy armaments is advisable. The whole of the propelling machinery of these vessels was contracted for in England.

Though Italy has a few other armour-clads, being either

built of wood or launched several years ago, they do not deserve particular consideration. Her unarmoured fleet has not been neglected whilst so much has been done in the other section of it. The 'Cristoforo Colombo,' of 2,500 tons displacement, a little more than that of our 'Comus' class, though partially built of wood, is a fine vessel, and is said to steam over 16 knots an hour. Other ships of similar type and improved construction are being built. The Italians have shown themselves as progressive in the matter of armament as in that of construction. Several of their unarmoured cruisers are armed with the new long-range and powerful breech-loaders of Sir William Armstrong. The strength of their naval *personnel* is 10,762 officers and men.

Like France, Germany adopted a regular 'programme,' and in 1873 set diligently to work to form a formidable fleet. That programme is still far from being complete. The two most powerful German ships, the 'Kaiser' and 'Deutschland,' were launched in England in 1874. They are central-battery ships of 7,500 tons displacement, and 7,900 horse-power, steaming 14·5 knots, and armed with eight 10½-inch steel Krupp guns. The armour at the water-line, in the wake of the engines, boilers, and magazines, is 10 inches thick, and elsewhere on the belt it is 8 inches amidships, tapering to 5 inches forward and aft. The 'Preussen' and 'Friedrich der Grosse'—sister ships of the vessel sunk off Dover in 1878—are sea-going turret ships like our 'Monarch,' but smaller. Of the newest German armour-clads—the first of which, the 'Sachsen,' was launched in 1877—the design is peculiar. They are 'protected' ships, and have an armoured citadel amidships, on the top of which at the fore end is a fixed turret with two guns in it mounted *en barbette*, and at the after end a square battery with a gun at each corner mounted in a similar manner. Four of these craft are either afloat or building, and a fifth is about to be laid down. They are of 7,135 tons displacement, 5,600 horse-power, and are said to have a speed of 14 knots. They are intended primarily for the defence of the German coast; though it is held that they can be sent to a distance if desirable. Germany has several other ironclads of older date or limited powers, and a class of armoured gunboats scarcely to be found in the navies of other countries. They are 1,000 tons each, and carry a 36-ton steel Krupp gun, which fires over the sides of a fixed turret plated with 8-inch armour. The unarmoured German cruisers are more or less exact reproductions of some in our own service.

‘But little originality has yet been exhibited in naval architecture or marine engineering by the German constructors. In commencing to build a navy it has been thought wise, in consideration of the great and varied experience of the English, to repeat the types which they have tried and found successful.’ (King, p. 316.)

The ‘Leipzig’ and ‘Prinz Adalbert’ are the largest of this kind. They have iron hulls cased with wood and sheathed with copper. Their displacement is 3,900 tons, and they can steam 15 knots. Ten others of a smaller class, and nearly equal speed, are to be completed, and some are already afloat and in commission. The two principal dockyards of Germany are at Kiel, in the Baltic, and Wilhelmshaven, on the North Sea. On the latter alone 3,000,000*l.* has already been expended. A third—a building yard—has been formed at Danzig, and has already cost large sums. The German navy is manned by 7,365 officers and men.

If Austria has competed in a race with Italy for naval pre-eminence, certainly—as far as the powers of individual ships go—she has been beaten. On the whole her navy is strong and efficient; but in it are no monsters comparable with those owned by her neighbour, by the French, or by the English. Mr. King places the Austrian fleet after that of Turkey, which a few years ago, he tells us, ‘was regarded as the third in ‘importance in Europe as to its *matériel*.’ Of her ten fighting armour-clads, seven are of iron; but several of these had been built originally of wood, and have been, or are being, rebuilt of the superior material. The most important is the ‘Tegetthoff,’ of 7,400 tons and 8,000 horse-power, with a speed of 14 knots. She is of the ‘central battery’ type, having a casemate amidships divided in two by a partition or bulkhead of thick armour, like our ‘Alexandra’ and ‘Téméraire,’ and carries six 11-inch Krupp guns. In places the armour of the water-line belt is 14½ inches thick. The principal unarmoured cruisers are the ‘Radetzky’ and the ‘Landon,’ of 3,400 tons and a speed of 15 knots. The great naval port and dockyard of Austria is at Pola, about sixty miles south of Trieste. The strength of her naval *personnel* is 8,133.

Russia appears to have given up all idea of forming a fleet equal to meeting on the high seas those of foreign Powers of the same rank as herself. Since 1875 she has not built a single armour-clad, though the ‘Minin,’ a ship begun as a turret-ship of the ‘Captain’ type, and afterwards altered to a belted *barbette* ship, was not finished till 1878. Of the twenty-nine armoured vessels on her list, not more than five at the outside can be considered ‘sea-going.’ The most powerful is the

‘Peter the Great,’ a ship allied in type to our ‘Devastation’ class.

‘She was launched in 1874; subsequently modifications were made, and as completed she somewhat resembles the “Dreadnought.” The principal dimensions are:—Length between the perpendiculars, 330 feet; breadth extreme, 64 feet; draught of water, 25 feet 6 inches; displacement, 9,510 tons, being 312 tons more than the “Devastation.”’ (King, p. 322.)

Her stoutest armour is 14 inches in thickness. She is armed with four breech-loading steel guns of the Krupp pattern, weighing 40 tons each. Mr. King says: ‘She is not fitted with a spar to utilise the power of the ram, and her speed is nearly one knot short of the “Devastation’s.”’ The latter ship, it may be remarked, has served a long commission in the Channel and the Mediterranean, and has proved an excellent sea-boat in bad weather and a comfortable vessel generally. The ‘Peter the Great’ has never gone to any great distance from Cronstadt. Notwithstanding this, it has been lately reported that a contract has been taken in Scotland to manufacture for her a new set of engines. Mr. King tells an anecdote concerning her which illustrates the peculiar difficulties under which the Russians labour in their attempts to maintain a powerful navy. When ice-bound at Cronstadt during the winter of 1876–7, her guns were frequently fired for exercise. On the breaking up of the ice the hull was found to leak a good deal, some of the steam cylinders were cracked, and other damage was discovered. A committee assembled to inquire into these circumstances reported that the injuries had been caused by the vibrations arising from the discharge of the guns when ‘the iron of the hull and machinery was under the influence of very low atmospheric temperature.’

There are two other classes of armour-clads in the Russian navy which deserve a passing notice. They are the ‘belted’ cruisers, which we have copied to some extent in our ‘Nelson,’ ‘Northampton,’ and ‘Shannon;’ and the ‘Popoffkas’ or circular ships. The ‘General-Admiral’ and the ‘Duke of Edinburgh’ belong to the former class. They have a belt of armour along the water-line and a *barbette* battery amidships. The ‘Duke of Edinburgh’ is about to be despatched to the Pacific, where the ‘Kuiasz Pojarski’ and the ‘Minin’—two of the five sea-going armour-clads of Russia—already are. The circular ships are intended for harbour defence; and, if regarded as floating forts, are no doubt useful and powerful vessels. Their peculiar shape, however, exposes them particularly to danger from torpedoes, and renders them, owing to the wide expanse of their

deck, especially open to the effects of both plunging and 'high angle' fire.

The later efforts of the Russian Admiralty have been directed rather to the formation of a considerable fleet of unarmoured cruisers than to the building of armour-clads. The number of their new cruisers bears an exceptionally high proportion to that of the mercantile marine which they would be required to protect in war. Mr. King observes:—

'Within the last five years the fast cruising fleet of Russia has been very largely augmented, until it has now attained proportions sufficient to excite the jealous interest of the maritime Powers of Europe. . . . Not only has the Russian Government itself expended large sums of money in the purchase and construction of cruising ships; but through its encouragement and co-operation a private committee has been formed at Moscow, by whose energetic efforts over 5,000,000 roubles [about 700,000*l.*] have been raised by private contributions for the purpose of building and equipping a fleet of cruisers. Of this sum about 560,000*l.* have already been expended in the purchase and equipment of five rapid cruisers; and the work of the committee is still indefatigably going on. These vessels, though at present private or only semi-official property, will of course be placed at the disposal of the Government in case of war.' (P. 330.)

Cruisers of high speed, armed with long-range breech-loading guns of the recent type, have been built for the Government in Russia. Two of these, the 'Rasboynik' and 'Najesdnik,' spent some time and made trials of their engines in the neighbourhood of Portsmouth in 1879. They are now in the Pacific. In 1878 the Russian Government purchased four swift iron steamers in America, and others from German owners at Hamburg. It has recently had constructed a large number of light-draught gunboats, each carrying an 11-inch gun. Russia has a numerous fleet of torpedo boats, of which a hundred were built during the year 1878. The *personnel* of her fleet—probably including dockyard workmen—numbers 42,168. At St. Petersburg there are two dockyards, one exclusively a building yard. At Nicholaieff, in the south, the 'Popoffkas' were constructed. Cronstadt is the great equipping yard of the Baltic.

Mr. King draws a very unflattering picture of the condition of the navy of the United States. Indeed, were its efficiency at the moment alone to be considered, it might with accuracy be ranked after that of Holland, and perhaps after those of Brazil and Japan. 'The American navy,' he says, 'is not at present possessed of a single armoured sea-going ship; and has, strictly, but few modern cruising vessels and no armaments of modern rifled guns.' The report of a Committee of

Congress stated that 'the armoured vessels are of value for coast and harbour defence, but are of no value as cruisers, and at sea would be unable to do any valuable service. The first-rates (unarmoured ships) were in their day fine specimens of naval architecture and an honour to the country, but they are of a past age, and can never be made useful as vessels of war.' Of the other unarmoured craft the Committee observes, 'They have neither speed nor guns of much power or range.' This curious opinion is added, 'In peace they are valuable, useful, and perhaps economical.' A remark which reminds one of the saying of the late Grand Duke Constantine, whose life had been spent in drilling the Russian army, that he hated war, for it spoilt the soldiers. The economy of an inefficient navy in peace time can scarcely be proved from the history of the force in the United States. Some figures given by Mr. King are instructive. At the beginning of the civil war the total number of ships of all kinds, harbour ships included, on the American list was eighty-two. From April 1, 1861, to April 1, 1865, sixty-three armoured vessels, one hundred and twenty unarmoured vessels, and twelve miscellaneous craft were built by and for the Navy Department, at a cost, exclusive of armaments, of upwards of 12,500,000*l*. In addition to building these 177 vessels, the Government purchased 497 from private owners for about 3,700,000*l*. more. Thus more than sixteen millions sterling, besides the cost of the armaments, had to be expended in bringing up the navy to the strength necessary to overcome a very insignificant naval antagonist. If ever a navy is likely to be used in earnest, the wisdom of maintaining it continuously in an efficient state can hardly be doubted after a knowledge of the above facts. The Americans are at present reconstructing several of their turret monitors, converting them, in fact, from wooden into iron vessels, and improving their armour and machinery. Though this is being done at an expense of some 200,000*l*. each, it is more than doubtful if the reconstructed vessels will come near in power to vessels of similar class in foreign services. The total *personnel* of the United States' navy is 11,552.

The political condition of Turkey renders it scarcely worth while to give any account of her navy, which, in *matériel* at least, as we have seen above, could but a short time ago have claimed a high rank amongst the navies of the world. With regard to the naval force of Spain, it may be said that of late it has rapidly declined—declined even from that state of weakness to which it had fallen after Trafalgar. 'The ships

'belonging to the navy of Spain,' we learn from Mr. King, 'are mostly of obsolete types, the armoured ships being too thinly protected to resist modern projectiles, and the unarmoured ships having neither guns of sufficient power to fight, nor sufficient speed to elude an enemy.' Relatively to the forces of other States, therefore, the Spanish navy is even more insignificant than that of America: notwithstanding this, it is manned by a body of good seamen, numbering 9,750, besides which there are corps of marine artillery and infantry.

Among the secondary maritime States, Holland holds a high place. When the modern reconstruction of fleets began, the Dutch were wise enough to avoid the mistakes of their neighbours, who built their earlier ironclads too often of wood. The consequence is, Holland has 'not a single wooden armoured ship appearing on her navy list.' Her most powerful ship is a sea-going turret ship, the '*Koning der Nederlanden*,' of 5,701 tons, and 4,630 horse-power. This vessel has 8-inch armour at the water-line, and carries an eclectic armament of four 11-inch Armstrong and four 4½-inch Krupp guns. Her speed is nearly twelve knots. The Dutch have another sea-going armour-clad of smaller dimensions, and no less than seventeen coast-service monitors. They also possess a fine squadron of new cruisers of about 3,000 tons and a speed of fourteen knots.

Like some of the greater Powers, Sweden also has a 'naval programme.' In 1876 the Minister of Marine proposed a plan of reconstruction, which was begun in 1877 and is to be completed by 1888. In accordance with its terms the Swedish navy was to comprise six rams with 14-inch armour, twenty armoured gunboats, and a number of unarmoured craft and torpedo boats. Sweden already has four turret vessels and ten armoured gunboats. Her force, like that of her sister kingdom Norway, which has her own navy and her own flag, is exclusively designed for home defence. The crews of the Swedish fleet amount to 5,607 men, of the Norwegian to 2,350. Denmark has seven armour-clads, all of them built of iron. The most powerful is the lately completed '*Helgoland*,' a central-battery ship of 5,265 tons and 3,700 horse-power, having armour twelve inches thick at the water-line and ten inches on the battery, and armed with five heavy Krupp breech-loaders. The '*Odin*,' plated with 8-inch armour tapering at the extremities to five inches, and carrying four 18-ton guns, is the next in size and power. She is only a little over 3,000 tons displacement.

The Brazilian navy has eighteen armour-clads and fifty-two

unarmoured vessels of all classes. Many of the former, however, were specially constructed for service during the war in Paraguay, and are practically obsolete at present. Two only are considered of the modern type. They are 'double turreted sea-going vessels,' with a displacement of 3,641 tons, a maximum thickness of armour of 12 inches, and an armament of four 10-inch Whitworth steel guns. Their highest speed is put at 11 knots. The navy of Brazil, though probably not very formidable on the high seas, is yet capable of doing good service for home defence; it is manned by about 4,900 officers and men. Brazil's neighbour, the Argentine Republic, has also a navy in which there are three armour-clads. Of these, one, the 'San Martin,' is now being finished on the Thames, where she was recently launched; she will be one of the first, probably the very first, ship to go to sea with the new composite or 'steel-faced' armour-plating. She will also have for her armament eight of the new powerful 8-inch guns made by Sir William Armstrong & Co. Her displacement is 4,000 tons, and her armour is to be 8 and 10 inches thick.

The brilliant actions of which the South Pacific has lately been the scene have reminded us that both Chili and Peru are naval Powers. Indeed, the navy of Chili has a history of respectable length and some distinction. It was under the flag of Chili that Lord Cochrane performed some of his most gallant feats. Early in 1820, with a frigate, a brig, and a schooner, he attacked the forts of Valdivia, armed with 118 guns and garrisoned by 1,600 men, and captured them in two days. In November of the same year he cut out the Spanish frigate 'Esmeralda' from under the guns of the castles of Callao. During the present sanguinary and desolating war both the Chilian and Peruvian navies have shown themselves worthy successors of the men whom Cochrane led, and who expelled the Spaniards. The Peruvian fleet now hardly exists. The Chilians have two handy and powerful armour-clads, built in this country, as well as the turret ship 'Huascar,' which they captured from their enemy.

Even this enumeration, long as it is, does not exhaust the list of naval States. We have only to cross the Pacific from South America to find a respectable fleet in Japan, and a far from despicable force even in China. Besides two older armour-clads, which, except against unarmoured ships such as those which compose the greater part of the Western squadrons in Japanese waters, can scarcely be considered very formidable, Japan has three armoured ships lately built in England. Of

these, one is 3,718 tons, and the others, which are 'belted cruisers,' are 2,200. There are also one or two fast un-armoured cruisers of the new type. The navy of Japan has been entirely organised on the English model. Officers of our service have in fact established it, and have trained its officers and men. Much of our nautical phraseology has been adopted in the service of the Mikado. There is a splendid Government dockyard at Yokosuka, about twelve miles from the treaty port of Yokohama, with a dry dock in which more than one of our armour-clads has been received; and there is also a fine dry dock, said by Sir Edward Reed in his recent book to be amongst the largest in the world, nearly completed at Nagasaki.

The Chinese naval *matériel* differs so completely in kind from that of Japan, that it might almost be fancied that we can trace in both the outward expression of the aspirations of the two countries, at least as regards foreign policy. The ships of the Japanese navy, intended to cruise on the high seas, and suitable for making attacks, possibly betoken the would-be aggressiveness of that impulsive and imitative nation. Those of the Chinese, on the other hand, are chiefly intended for home defence, and, not unlikely, exhibit the desire of that people to be left alone by strangers. One thing is quite certain, and that is, that they have shown no reluctance to avail themselves of Western skill and appliances to secure the defence of their country. They have done this in recent years to such an extent that the power of the empire to resist aggression has been increased in a remarkable manner. 'It is a mistake,' says Mr. King, 'to regard the Chinese as an effete nation, not to be reckoned as a factor in international problems. . . . The marvellous resuscitation of China during the last eighteen years is nowhere more apparent than in the development of her military and naval strength.' Dockyards and arsenals have been constructed, and ships have been launched, and their engines, and even their guns in some cases, made at one or the other of them. The history of the naval dockyard near Foo-chow, on the river Min, will give an idea of the energy which has characterised the proceedings of the Chinese in the reorganisation of their defensive forces. In 1867 the preliminary works were begun. The site was very unfavourable. It was necessary 'to raise the level of the ground five feet above that of the original *paddy-field*, on the unstable soil of which the works had to be constructed.' Nevertheless in seven years not only had an important arsenal been constructed from its foundations, but eighteen vessels

were built at it, and in great part had their engines made in its workshops. Of these, twelve were over 1,200 tons displacement. There is another dockyard near Shanghai, at which two steam frigates have been launched, and the only ironclad—a small one for river service—as yet possessed by the Chinese. At this establishment * small arms and other munitions of war have been turned out in large quantities for several years. There is a gun factory at Nanking, and a cartridge factory and powder works on different banks of the Pei-ho, near Tien-tsin. The Chinese have also recently acquired some dry docks, the property of an English company, at Whampoa, near Canton.

The most formidable members of the home-defence fleet of China are undoubtedly the gunboats on the plan of Mr. George Rendel of the great Elswick firm. Eight of these are now in China. Two are 319 tons each, and carry one 26½-ton gun: two are 400 tons, and carry 'each a 38-ton gun of the 'British service pattern.' The four newer ones are 440 tons, draw about 10 feet of water, can steam 10 knots, and are armed with one of Sir William Armstrong's 11-inch 35-ton guns. The projectile of this piece is said by Mr. King to be capable of piercing 17 inches of iron armour at 1,000 yards' range; whilst that of the heavier 38-ton gun, carried by the larger turret ships of the British navy, is, according to him, only able to penetrate 15½ inches at the same distance.

We are glad to see that Mr. King does not concur in the extravagant opinions as to the value of these gunboats current when the last squadron of them sailed from this country. We were then given to understand that some dozen of them, which could be got for the price of one first-class armour-clad, would be more than a match for the latter; and that small craft of the kind would sweep the armour-clads of huge size from the sea. Our author says:—

'These boats are primarily intended for coast defence, and if properly manned will no doubt give a great deal of trouble to Japan or any other nation which may dare to invade the sanctity of Celestial waters. Extravagant estimates, however, of their merits have been formed. They are a long step in advance, and—for special service—a valuable addition to a fleet, but they are not likely to revolutionise naval architecture. As at present constructed they are not free from objections, one of which is the want of lateral movement of the gun without movement of the vessel, particularly in rivers, where otherwise such craft would be especially serviceable. Besides this they have not the speed to escape from an armoured ship, and to operate with

* In November 1880 news came from China to the effect that a 7-inch 'polygrooved' rifled gun had been made at this establishment.

tolerable efficiency the water must be tolerably smooth, and at such times it would not be difficult with well-directed shots to send one of them to the bottom.' (Pp. 431-2.)

It might have been added, that these vessels are penetrable by the lightest guns in use, even those carried by steam launches, and that so filled are they with the machinery that propels them, steers them, or works their guns, that it would be difficult for even a projectile of small diameter to pierce them without doing serious mischief. Moreover, having attained such large dimensions as are implied by their displacement of 440 tons, they cannot safely rely upon the impunity from an enemy's fire, due to smallness of target, which with some reason was claimed for earlier examples of the type of not more than half the size. Mr. King makes an observation which is worth repeating. It is this: 'It will be thus seen that China, the "effete" nation of the East, but just entered into the race between modern naval Powers, has already actually put to sea more powerful guns than any other nation on the globe;' the 'Inflexible' and 'Duilio,' with 80-ton and 100-ton guns, being not yet complete for service.

We have now to see what, in view of this immense addition to the aggregate naval power of the world in general and to that of individual States, is the condition of the British navy. The largest ship is the 'Inflexible.' She is one of the 'protected' vessels before spoken of, and has been described as 'a floating castle, 110 feet long and 75 feet wide, rising 10 feet out of water, and having above that again two round turrets 'planted diagonally at its opposite corners.' Castle and turrets are thickly armoured, and each turret carries two 80-ton guns. These can be fired, all four, ahead or astern, the turrets being placed with their centres on opposite sides of the midship line. 'Attached to the rectangular castle, but completely submerged—every part being 6 to 7 feet under water—there is a hull of ordinary form with a powerful ram-bow, twin screws, and submerged rudder and helm.' Above the submerged part is an unarmoured structure carried to a height of 20 feet above the water. The 'Inflexible,' in fact, is an unarmoured ship with a very thickly armoured part and two armoured turrets in the centre; this plated part resting on an iron deck 3 inches thick, which is often spoken of as 'horizontal armour.' She has a displacement of 11,407 tons. Over the armour deck the space is divided into compartments arranged to carry coals and water-excluding stores so packed as to form further subdivisions of the space. Next to the ship's side the compartments are filled with cork, and

inside this are subdivisions filled with layers of canvas and oakum. The object of this is to insure the floatation if the unarmoured part of the hull is perforated by shot. 'The cork is intended as a life-belt to the ship when the unprotected ends are riddled and filled with water.' The hull, into the construction of which steel has largely entered, has a double bottom and many water-tight bulkheads. The armour of the citadel is composed of two layers of plates each 12 inches thick, or 24 in all. The armour of the turrets is also in two layers; the outer is of steel-faced plates 9 inches, and the inner of iron 7 inches in thickness. It will be interesting to compare our most powerful ship with the most important vessels belonging to foreign navies.

	Inflexible	Dandolo	Amiral Duperré
Length	320 feet	340 ft. 11 in.	319 ft. 10 in.
Beam	75 feet	64 ft. 9 in.	66 ft. 11 in.
Displacement . .	11,107 tons	10,101 tons	10,322 tons
Horse-power . .	8,407	7,900	7,397
Speed	*15 knots	15 knots	14·5 knots
No. of turret guns. .	4	4	4
Weight of each gun .	80 tons	100 tons	46 tons
Total energy of each gun	29,663 foot-tons	40,100 foot-tons	
Maximum thickness of armour	21 inches	21·65 inches	21·6 inches
Cost	£553,954	£700,000	£494,468
Cost per ton . . .	£48 12s.	£67 6s.	£47 18s.

The speed of all three ships may be considered, and the final trials of each will probably show it, to be nearly alike. The Italian ship is by far the most costly; and if we take note of the superior thickness of her armour—about $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches—the British ship is certainly the least so. Her one point of inferiority to the 'Dandolo' is the inferior power of her guns.

Next to the 'Inflexible' come three turret ships, the 'Dreadnought,' 'Thunderer,' and 'Devastation.' The two latter closely resemble each other. In fact, in principal dimensions they are alike. All three ships are plated all round the low side, on the walls of the central casemate, and on the two turrets placed on the midship line of the ship above this casemate. But in the 'Dreadnought' the latter is as wide as the ship, in

the others its walls stand well within the sides of the ship. The 'Dreadnought' may be compared with the 'Duilio,' the 'Dandolo's' sister ship, which vessel she closely approaches in size.

	Dreadnought	Duilio
Displacement	10,886 tons	10,401 tons
Horse-power	8,216	7,710
Thickest armour on hull .	14 inches	21.65 inches.
Turret armour	14 inches	11.81 inches
No. of turret guns . . .	4	4
Weight of each gun . . .	38 tons	100 tons
Total energy of each gun .	11,357 foot-tons	40,100 foot-tons
Cost	494,160 <i>l</i> .	700,000 <i>l</i> .
Cost per ton	45 <i>l</i> . 8 <i>s</i> .	67 <i>l</i> . 6 <i>s</i> .

Though the water-line armour of the 'Dreadnought' is only 14 inches at the thickest, it is carried all the way round the hull. The one point in which she seems to be considerably inferior to the Italian ship is in her armament, which here, as in the 'Inflexible's' case, shows the weakest item in the comparison.

The 'Peter the Great' and the English 'Devastation' are avowedly rival ships. The following comparison should prove interesting :—

	Devastation	Peter the Great
Displacement	9,387 tons	9,820 tons
Horse-power	6,650	8,700 *
Thickest armour on hull .	12 inches	11 inches
Turret armour	14 inches	14 inches
No. of turret guns . . .	4	4
Weight of each gun . . .	35 tons	40 tons
Total energy of each gun .	8,200 foot-tons	9,408 foot-tons

We have no information as to the cost of the 'Peter the Great,' but her machinery cost 156,000*l*. against 61,327*l*. for the 'Devastation's.' In this case also may be noticed an inferiority in gun-power on the part of the British vessel.

The 'Inflexible' may be accepted as the type of the sea-going turret ship in its latest form. Four other vessels of the

* The new engines ordered in Scotland are reported to be of 7,000 horse-power.

class are being prepared. Two, which are approaching completion—the ‘*Ajax*’ and the ‘*Agamemnon*’—are about 3,000 tons less than the ‘*Inflexible*.’ Their displacement is 8,492 tons, and their horse-power 6,000. The armament is to consist of four 38-ton guns. The armour on the water-line of the central citadel is thus disposed : ‘first, 10 inches of teak next to the iron hull, faced with 8 inches of iron ; then 9 inches of teak faced with 10 inches of iron ; making in all 18 inches of iron, and 19 inches of armour.’ On the turrets there are to be steel-faced plates of 14 inches in one thickness. The two others, called the ‘*Colossus*’ and ‘*Majestic*,’ are somewhat larger. Their displacement is to be 9,150 tons, and their horse-power 6,000. They were begun in 1879, and are the ‘first armoured ships laid down by the British to be constructed of steel.’ The armament will probably consist, we are told, of four breech-loading guns of about 40 tons weight in the turrets, and six light shell guns on the superstructure. The introduction of heavy breech-loaders into the equipment of our new ships indicates the beginning of an important reformation of our naval ordnance. Mr. King says of these pieces that they will be ‘the first British breech-loaders ever mounted in a turret. These guns will be much more powerful than the 38-ton guns of the “*Dreadnought*.”’ Another ship, building at Chatham, the ‘*Conqueror*,’ with a displacement of 6,200 tons, is to have but one turret. We find also that a ship of a new type is being designed, or probably by this time actually begun. The armament will consist of two 43-ton breech-loaders, revolving within each of two fixed *barbette* turrets, and a battery of breech-loading guns capable of piercing armour between them.

One ship that will soon be completed is so novel in design, that some description of her seems necessary. The late First Lord of the Admiralty described her as ‘of a kind as yet unknown in any part of the world.’ She is said, when launched, to resemble a cylinder floating on its side and deeply immersed, the ends being tapered, so as to form a bow and stern. The top of the cylinder is flattened to form a deck, which is to be plated with steel armour. A complete cross-section of this curious vessel is similar in outline to that of a peg-top. She is built throughout of steel. She is expected to attain a speed of seventeen knots an hour, and is to have no guns, her offensive weapons being her ram and Whitehead torpedoes. She is called the ‘*Polyphemus*.’

It will have been observed that, with the exception of the two vessels of special type just mentioned, all the heavy fight-

ing ships lately laid down or completed for the English navy are of the turret class. We still have, however, a formidable fleet of broadside ships. The 'Alexandra,' the flag-ship of the Commander-in-Chief in the Mediterranean, is of this description. She is fully rigged, and has a two-storied battery amidships, so arranged as to give a heavy bow fire and an efficient fire towards the stern. Her displacement is 9,492 tons, and horse-power 8,615. Another ship, also in the Mediterranean, the 'Temeraire,' has a central battery, and two fixed *barbette* turrets on the upper deck. We may compare her with a French ship, the 'Redoutable,' of about the same size :—

	Temeraire	Redoutable
Displacement	8,540 tons	8,661 tons
Horse-power	7,700	5,918
Thickest armour at water-line .	11 inches	14 inches
Do. on turrets or casemate .	10 inches	9½ inches
Guns—No.	four 25-ton four 18-ton	six 23-ton six light
Cost	£363,528	£370,000* (hull alone)

The price of the British ship is given as including her machinery, and compares very favourably with that of the French.

Considering the extreme importance of providing adequate protection for our enormous and increasing mercantile marine, an examination of the special classes of ships designed to insure it will not be without interest, and may properly precede the inquiry which it is proposed to make into our relative naval strength in general. Allusion has already been made to the 'belted' ships which, in all services in which they are found, are included amongst the armour-clads. They are, nevertheless, specially intended to bear an important share in the protection of our commerce on the ocean. 'Their object,' we are informed by the Controller of the Navy, 'is not to take part in close engagements, but to roam over the seas and drive away those wasps—fast cruisers—which we are told are to be brought to bear upon us by stopping our trade, and preventing our carrying on that commerce in which we have always taken the foremost place all over the world.' Vessels of the kind are, however, few in number, and it is to unarmoured cruisers of

* These figures are taken from a speech in the French Chamber by M. E. Farcy.

high speed—aided, likely enough, in time of war by armed merchant steamers—that we must continue to look principally for the security of our maritime communications.

Our unarmoured cruising fleet is divided into seven or eight classes. The 'Shah' is the largest unarmoured ship in the British service. She has a displacement of 6,040 tons, 477 horse-power, and a speed of more than $16\frac{1}{2}$ knots. She carries 26 guns, two of them of 18 tons. The 'Inconstant,' like her, built of iron and cased with wood, is a little smaller, and has about the same speed. The 'Raleigh' may be compared with the largest French ships, which she approaches in size.

	Raleigh	Duquesne
Displacement	5,200 tons	5,350 tons
Horse-power	6,158	5,917
Speed	15.5 knots	15.9 knots

The British ship, it should be remembered, has been in commission and at sea for seven years, the French ship is quite six years more recent in date. In the next class of 'iron corvettes' Mr. King makes an instructive comparison between one member of the class and a corresponding French cruiser. The principal points of the comparison may be reproduced:—

	Rover	Duguay-Trouin
Displacement	3,491 tons	3,140 tons
Horse-power	4,964	3,722
Speed	15 knots	15 knots
Cost	£156,492	£158,220

The cost of armament of the 'Duguay-Trouin' is included in the above sum; that of the 'Rover's' is not, but it is probably fully compensated for by the excess of the latter's tonnage and engine-power.

Our author also gives us another comparison which is worth reproduction. It is between one of our less recent 'composite,' or partly iron and partly wooden, corvettes, the 'Garnet,' and the wholly wooden American corvette 'Vandalia,' of—with perhaps a single exception—the most important cruising class in the United States' navy.

	Garnet	Vandalia
Displacement	2,162 tons	2,033 tons
Horse-power	2,000	1,200
Speed	13 knots	12 knots
Cost :—Hull, &c.	£64,355	£68,862
Do. Machinery	£27,111	£29,864
Do. Total	£91,466	£98,726

Not only is the larger, more powerfully engined, and swifter English ship the cheaper, but she is built on a better system and of more durable materials. In the matter of cost, too, we should bear in mind what we are told in the book before us:—

‘A nominal percentage is added to the actual cost of labour, materials, and stores entering into the construction of a [British] vessel, to cover what is believed to be the ship’s share of the value of maintenance of the plant, appliances, tools, fuel, &c., necessarily employed in the dockyards as shipbuilding establishments. . . . This added percentage is part of the total cost of every ship, and should not be lost sight of in making comparisons between the cost of British and American ships of war.’ (Pp. 248–9.)

Iron seems likely to be superseded by steel in shipbuilding as thoroughly as it has superseded wood. Two corvettes built in 1874 were the last wooden fighting vessels that were or are likely to be added to the British navy. On the list now there are two classes of steel cruisers; one composed of two individuals, the ‘Iris’ and ‘Mercury,’ both steaming more than $18\frac{1}{2}$ knots an hour; and another of nine, known as the C class, because the names of all the ships in it begin with that letter. In the construction of the latter some iron is used, but they are built mostly of steel, and are cased with wood. They are about the same size as the French ‘Villars’ and her sisters, being of 2,383 tons displacement and 2,300 horse-power. Their speed, however, is from one and a half to two knots less than that with which the French ships are credited. With regard to this point, we may recall what Mr. King has said in the early part of his work: ‘In examining the lists it will be noticed that the speeds of French ships must be overrated when compared with the English ships of equal displacement and engine-power.’ The design of these new corvettes of ours is such that they must be regarded as ‘protected’ ships, but slightly inferior in defensive capabilities to armour-clads. Water-tight bulkheads extend from the keel to the upper deck, and cofferdams of iron are built round engines, boilers, and magazines to

neutralise the effect of shot. There is also over the machinery and ammunition a steel deck an inch and a half in thickness.

The descriptions given above of the leading ships in the several navies of the world will have shown how continuous has been the progress in naval design. The moderate plating throughout the whole side of an armour-clad has given place to armour of great thickness concentrated on a limited portion of the ship, the protection elsewhere being provided by subdivision into cells and compartments, and the introduction of unsinkable materials. The armour, too, has itself undergone a change, and the 'composite' or steel-faced plate has already been substituted for simple wrought iron on the surfaces of turrets and casemated batteries. By this the protection is rendered more efficient, as 12 inches of the new plating is said to have equal resisting power with 15 inches of the old; whilst 'against oblique fire there will remain beyond this a considerable advantage in favour of the steel-faced plates.' In the unarmoured fleet new materials of construction have been introduced. As the composite system supplanted the wood, and the iron the composite, so now we see that the steel is supplanting the iron. In propelling machinery the low-pressure engines have been to a great extent superseded by the compound plan of low and high pressure cylinders, thereby causing a great economy of fuel, and consequently giving to ships an increased power of going to long distances from their coaling stations. In five years upwards of seventy vessels built for the British service have had engines of this kind put on board them. It was adopted in France 'after its success' was established in the British navy.

The use of the torpedo as a naval weapon has been greatly extended. We have seen that it is to be the chief armament of the 'Polyphemus;' besides which all important members of both the armoured and unarmoured classes in our service are provided with appliances for using the Whitehead torpedo. This is the case too with the ships of foreign Powers. As Sir Spencer Robinson has said, 'torpedoes are but another and 'more destructive form of artillery.' No navy now is without a certain number of swift torpedo boats, which are undoubtedly most effective components of a coast-defence force, and may perhaps prove of value also on the high seas. The reply to the torpedo boat is the machine gun. This weapon admits of a rapid continuous fire from several barrels united in a single gun. The enormous number of shots which can be fired in a few seconds, the accuracy of the piece, and the perforating effect of its bullets, seem to render it very doubtful if a torpedo-

boat attack could be made by daylight on a ship armed with a suitable number of these weapons. In the French navy the Hotchkiss gun is used; in ours and in several Continental services, the Nordenfolt.

Gunnery has not ceased to advance whilst ship construction, engine making, and armour plating have been making progress. The heaviest guns carried by Admiral Farragut's flag-ship in 1862, when he captured the Mississippi forts, were 9-inch smooth-bores, firing 90-lb. shot with 13 lbs. of powder. The Krupp 71-ton gun and the Woolwich 80-ton gun have projectiles weighing 1,700 lbs., and the Italian 100-ton gun—made by a private English firm—a projectile weighing over 2,000 lbs. Guns have been chambered; that is, the portion of the bore in which the cartridge rests has been enlarged, enabling a heavier powder charge to be used, which imparts a greater effect to the shot and diminishes the strain on the gun. Mr. King gives some very interesting results of recent gunnery experiments.

‘The 12-inch 35-ton Woolwich gun gives an energy to its projectile of 219 foot-tons per inch of circumference, and this is estimated to carry it through 14 inches of iron at 500 yards. The shot from the new 8-inch Armstrong gun, with 95-lb. charge, will pass through this target, or, in other words, the new 8-inch gun of 11½ tons can equal in penetration the shot from the 35-ton gun.’ (P. 462.)

We find descriptions of other guns made by Sir William Armstrong which possess a similar remarkable power. The efforts of private makers to improve the efficiency of heavy ordnance have not been confined to this country. Mr. King speaks strongly in approval of the powerful weapons produced by Krupp of Essen, and says, ‘It is certainly a forcible argument in his favour, that the manifest tendency of all Governments and gunmakers is towards the adoption of many of those features which he has already incorporated into his system.’ We have (at page 472) a comparison between the three heaviest guns known—Sir William Armstrong's 100-ton gun (which the Italians have put on board the ‘Duilio’), the Woolwich 80-ton gun, and the Krupp 71-ton gun. From this we learn that the amount of iron armour which will be penetrated by the Italian gun is 36 inches, by the German 33½ inches, and by the English (which is nine tons heavier than the German) 32 inches; the power in relation to weight being highest in Krupp's weapon. Another gun by the latter maker, weighing 18 tons, is said to have the same power of penetrating armour as the Woolwich gun of 38 tons. It is important to notice the power of these weapons

of Krupp's pattern, for it seems that all the ships launched within the last few years by Austria, Denmark, Sweden, and Holland—the navies of which were at one time chiefly or exclusively armed with guns of the English kind—now carry those of the German maker. The rifled guns of the German and Russian navies have always been either of his manufacture or made on the same design as his. Though the Italians procure their heavy naval guns from England, they make their own gunpowder at a place called Fossano, and seem to have obtained some remarkable results from it. Some experiments with the 100-ton gun are reported, in which 'the Fossano powder gave 282½ foot-tons more energy than the English, with a reduction of four tons in the pressure on the interior surface of the gun.' The great accuracy of the Krupp guns is also attributed 'in some degree to the well-adapted prismatic powder employed,' an explosive which has long been used in the Russian and German services, and which is said to be of excellent quality.

On the whole we do not appear to compare with foreign fleets in the matter of armament so favourably as in all other particulars. Mr. King does not attempt to account for this striking exception to a general superiority, which he never fails to point out; but contents himself with observing that 'the armaments of all the British ships are furnished from Woolwich under the War Department, and are not included in the naval estimates granted by Parliament.' We learn from him, however, that some powerful new guns are to be made for the navy. These are to be breech-loaders, and, as before stated, will probably be ready in time to arm the turrets of the 'Conqueror,' the 'Colossus,' and the 'Majestic' a year or two hence.

One of the most interesting parts of this valuable and instructive work is that devoted to an examination of the comparative strength of the British and French navies. In it an article published by Sir Spencer Robinson in the 'Nineteenth Century' for March 1880 is criticised very freely. Sir Spencer considered our ironclad fleet to be less strong than was commonly supposed, and had deducted from the grand total of our armoured ships on January 1, 1879, amounting to 69, all but 'thirteen ironclads fit for sea and of enormous power.' These he divided into two classes, putting six in the first and seven in the second. Against this he placed the armoured navy of France, and gave credit to both Powers also for ships under repair and requiring repair, which he supposed might be ready by June 1880. The result was that by that

date England would have eight first-class ships, to be reinforced soon after by three more; and France eight, to be reinforced by two more before the end of the year. As to the second class, he counted for the English twelve ships, to be shortly reinforced by another; and for the French twelve, the displacement and thickness of armour of the former being decidedly superior. He further went on to state, that France had some ironclad floating batteries, and ten sea-going ironclads, some in indifferent condition. 'Ship for ship,' he said, 'we have no equivalent on our side, but instead a mass of ships of most diverse dimensions and qualities . . . altogether of an unsatisfactory nature.'

It was surprising that, considering the eminence and distinguished public services of the author, but little notice was taken in England of this comparison, so unfavourable to the efficiency of our fleet. This, perhaps, is another indication of that deficient interest in naval matters which has before been spoken of. It has remained for an American to point out how 'very erroneous and misleading' it was. Of course since the article appeared the work of the dockyards in England and in France has not stood still, and ships have been launched or repaired and made ready for sea in both, in the interval, in numbers which render Sir Spencer Robinson's statements almost obsolete. Nevertheless, it is necessary to call attention to a point which really vitiates his whole argument. He has, as Mr. King justly remarks, in the case of the British armour-clads, 'applied the most rigid rules of elimination, 'excluding all ships not fully completed, all not in thorough repair, or needing new boilers, and all having not more than 'six inches of armour;' whilst 'his acknowledged want of 'familiarity with the condition and real efficiency of many of 'the French ships precludes any attempt at a thorough 'analysis of their list.'

The American writer, whose official inspections of the naval *matériel* of our own and of Continental fleets, and whose great technical knowledge eminently qualify him to form an opinion, may certainly be regarded as an entirely unprejudiced arbiter on the claims of the two navies to superior efficiency. His observations may therefore be repeated with profit. He says :—

'Had he applied equally severe rules to the analysis of the French fleet, there would not have remained from its list of nominal sea-going ships more than six or seven of the same [the first] class, even supposing them all to be in thorough repair. To illustrate the looseness and inaccuracy of the comparison he has made, it may be said that to

make out the number of eight first-class sea-going armour-clads fully completed belonging to France, it is apparent, although they are not indicated by name, that he has to include three wooden ships of old style having light armour, and these he sets against modern British fighting ships like the "Dreadnought" and the "Thunderer." Where the twelve French ships of the second class are obtained is not apparent, unless either ships rated as coast-defenders or those still incomplete or now obsolete are included, though all these classes are expressly deducted from the British list. But it is of course improper to exclude from the effective fleet of either nation new ships not fully completed, or those undergoing or needing repair, or requiring new boilers. Under the former head would be included some of the most powerful of the British ships. Any person familiar with the magnificent resources of the British royal dockyards, and their numerous [private] dockyards and iron-ship yards, thoroughly equipped with all the plant and appliances requisite for modern war-ship and engine construction, can conceive with what rapidity unfinished ships would be completed, and needed repairs would be effected, should an emergency arise demanding it.' (P. 266.)

His own comparative estimate gives to the English twenty-eight armoured ships, not one of wood, with an average thickness of armour of 11·6 inches, and an average speed of 13·7 knots; and to the French twenty-one ships, several of which have wooden hulls, with an average thickness of armour of 11 inches, and an average speed of 13 knots. With respect to the unarmoured cruisers of the two nations suitable for the ocean service of modern warfare, gun vessels and small craft being deducted, the American officer computes that

'the modern unarmoured fleet of Great Britain consists of three frigates, twenty-one corvettes, and two vessels of the rapid type; while the French fleet, after making equivalent deductions and omitting vessels of old type, comprises four frigates, two of which are building, and twelve corvettes of modern construction. The average speed of the British ships is undoubtedly higher than that of the French.'

Some value should also be given to the 419 merchant steamers of this country between 1,200 and 5,000 tons, very many of which have high speed, and might without difficulty be transferred to the Royal Navy in case of war.

In the foregoing survey of the navies of the world, sufficient details concerning each of them will have been given to enable a correct estimate to be formed of the enormous recent increase of naval power in all quarters. The aggregate naval strength of foreign States has no doubt been greatly augmented. At the same time it is equally certain that, relatively to any single State, our own strength is more considerable than it was not very long ago. Many persons must remember the well-

founded apprehensions with which the near equality of the French navy to ours was regarded in the heyday of the Second Empire. The distance between the two is far greater now. No doubt the French have made and are making great efforts to increase their force, and only a continuance of similar efforts on our part will insure our keeping ahead of them. But there is no sign as yet that we are slackening our pace in the ever-continuing race for maritime pre-eminence. It is true that our increasing sea-borne commerce, and growing dependence on foreign imports for our food, render the task of maintaining our position a more and more difficult, as well as a more and more necessary one. But the impartial opinions of the author whose book is being noticed go far to assure us that this task is not neglected. The work, indeed, is filled with evidences of the efficiency of the British navy, and repeatedly bears testimony to the brilliant success of our naval architects in solving the apparently almost insoluble problems of modern war-ship construction. It places the labours of that distinguished profession in a singularly honourable light. Their designs are copied in every navy in existence, even in those which hitherto have persistently followed lines of their own. We question if there be any other art or science followed in England which so universally and indisputably gives the law to all countries as that of naval architecture. The skill of our constructors has been wisely seconded by the enlightened policy of the Admiralty, which, we are told, has been steadily to encourage private works, which tends not only to expand the resources of the kingdom, but also to obtain the best constructive and mechanical ability.

We have seen at how low a cost, relatively to those of other Powers, some of our most important ships have been built. It is pleasant to be able to show that this economy may be asserted of our naval administration in general. Taking the ordinary annual expenditure of the chief maritime nations of Europe, we should find that the average share in the total sum expended of every ton of armoured and unarmoured fighting shipping in the sea-going squadrons is: in Russia, nearly 100*l.*; France, 54*l.* 6*s.*; Germany, 50*l.* 6*s.*; England, 43*l.* 18*s.*; Italy, 40*l.* 4*s.*; Austria, 31*l.* 8*s.* But Italy and Austria have no squadrons on foreign stations. The average share of each member of the *personnel* is lower in England than in France or Germany. A French Admiralty official calculated in 1878 that the annual cost of the maintenance and repair of each ton of shipping was 3*l.* 13*s.* in France and 1*l.* 4*s.* in England. The cost of coals and engine-room stores in the

former country was 18s. 7d. per ton; in the latter 12s. 1d. He also estimated that the general constant expenses of maintaining the dockyards, irrespective of the work done in them, was 258,000*l.* for the French, and 147,000*l.* for the English; and that the general superintendence of these establishments in France was more than double that of the English. Supposing the chief object of a navy to be the protection of the mercantile marine and ocean trade, to protect every 100 tons of merchant shipping costs annually, in France, 778*l.*; Russia, 694*l.*; Austria, 256*l.*; Italy, 187*l.*; England, 115*l.*; to protect every 1,000*l.* worth of sea-borne imports and exports costs—in Russia, about 35*l.* 18s.; Austria, 28*l.* 10s.; France, 26*l.* 16s.; Italy, 25*l.* 8s.; Germany, 22*l.* 16s.; England, 17*l.* 5s. Had the trade and shipping of the colonies—other than their trade with the mother country—been considered, the English figures would have been lower. Whether we spend our money wisely or not, there is no doubt that we obtain more for what we do spend than any other country.

- ART. III. — 1. *Jacques d'Artevelde.* Par KERVYN DE LETTENHOVE. Gand: 1863.
2. *Recherche des Antiquitez et Noblesse de Flandres.* Par PHILIPPE DEL'ESPINOY, Vicomte de Théroutenne. Douay: 1632.
3. *Annales de Flandres de P. d'Oudegherst.* Par M. LES-BROUSSART. Gand: 1789.
4. *Korte Levensschets van Jacob van Arteveld.* Door LIEVEN EVERWYN. Gent: 1845.
5. *Mémoires sur la ville de Gand.* Par le Chevalier CHARLES-LOUIS DIERICKX. Gand: 1814.
6. *Cronijcke van den Lande ende Graefschcepe van Vlaenderen.* Gemaeet door JOR. NICOLAES DESPARS. Te Brugge: 1839.
7. *Memorie Boek der Stadt Ghent, 1301–1737.* Ghent: 1839.
8. *Le Siècle des Artevelde.* Par LÉON VANDERKINDERE, Professeur à l'Université de Bruxelles. Bruxelles: 1879.

THE oldest, and perhaps the strongest, link which binds England to the continent of Europe, is the relation of this country to Flanders. There, on the eastern shore of the German Ocean, where Charlemagne planted a Saxon colony

a thousand years ago on the *littus Saxonicum*, still lives a people singularly congenial to ourselves. The same eager pursuit of trade, the same skill in manufactures, the same attachment to municipal government and political freedom, and during many centuries a common fear of France, united the people of England to the people of Bruges, Ghent, and Antwerp. In times of trouble and persecution many an English fugitive found a refuge in the Scheldt; and from the Counts of Flanders to the Dukes of Burgundy, and even to their Spanish descendants and heirs, the rulers of the Low Countries almost invariably looked to the alliance and support of the English Crown. To this day the independence of Belgium is an object of paramount interest to England. The history of the Commons of Flanders is therefore one of peculiar interest to ourselves, and we shall make no apology for presenting to our readers an episode taken from these Flemish annals. A great English poet has already given to the name of Philip van Arteveld a lasting place in English literature. Our present subject concerns the father of that eminent person, whose character and fate were not less heroic and tragical than those of his son. The numerous works placed at the head of this article sufficiently indicate the interest which attaches to the family of Arteveld, and we are indebted to them and to some researches of our own for the story we are about to lay before our readers.

Casting about for allies to aid him in enforcing his claim to the crown of France, Edward III. was counselled by his father-in-law, the Count of Hainault, to secure the support of the Flemish Communes. The chief manufacturing towns of Flanders had been alienated from their own Count, Louis de Nevers—sometimes called Louis de Crécy—by reason of his grievous exactions and entire submission to his overlord, the King of France. It was at the instigation of Philip of Valois that, in the autumn of 1336, the Count, without either provocation or warning, threw into prison every Englishman found within his territories. Philip's object was plainly manifest. There was nothing he more desired than to bring about a rupture between England and Flanders, for he had observed with much anxiety the excellent relations, based on mutual interests, that had sprung up between the wool-producers of the one country and the manufacturers of the other. As it chanced, he overshot the mark. Edward indeed shortly afterwards retaliated by arresting the Flemings within his own dominions, and prohibiting the exportation of wool. Deprived of the raw material of their industry, the Flemish looms were thrown out of work, and the weavers were reduced to destitu-

tion. They were sufficiently logical, however, to trace their sufferings to their true source, and to regard as their real enemy not the English monarch, but their own sovereign. Edward, moreover, took some trouble to exculpate himself, and assured both the Count of Flanders and the magistrates of the chief towns that he much desired to revive the old friendship which had proved so pleasant and advantageous alike to them and to his own subjects. To these overtures Louis de Nevers turned a deaf ear, for the privations of his people were, in his eyes, of much less importance than the favour of the Prince at whose Court he habitually resided.

In the following year the States of Flanders, Brabant, and Hainault, entered into an offensive and defensive alliance, by which they agreed to refer all future disputes between themselves to arbiters chosen from among their most eminent townsmen, and to reopen commercial relations with England. These resolutions having been communicated to Edward, he lost no time in deputing the Bishop of Lincoln and the Earls of Huntingdon and Salisbury to negotiate personally with the great men and great cities of Flanders. His envoys were instructed to express the King's readiness to re-establish the wool-staple in that province whence it had been removed to Dordrecht, and to betroth his daughter Joan to the Count's son, Louis de Mâle—so called from a chateau near Bruges in which he was born, and which is still inhabited. The Flemings naturally attached immense importance to having a depôt or emporium of wool in one of their own cities, because, as we read in the '*Cronique de Flandres* : '* 'Toute Flandres estoit fondee sur draperie, et sans laine on ne pouvoit draper.' The English envoys appear to have visited 'the three good towns' of Bruges, Ghent, and Ypres, but it was in Ghent they made their longest stay, and, according to Froissart, 'spent such sums that gold and silver seemed to fly out of their hands.' With all their patriotism the worthy Flemings had a keen eye to their personal interests; and Walsingham sarcastically remarks, '*plus saccos quam Anglos venerabantur.*' There is reason to believe that Jacob van Arteveld played a conspicuous part in the negotiations which ensued, and Sismondi is scandalised that a prelate so eminent as the Bishop of Lincoln should have condescended to hold

* *Cronique de Flandres*, anciennement composée par auteur incertain et nouvellement mise en lumière par Denis Sauvage de Fontenailles en Brie, Historiographe du Très Chrétien Roy Henry, second de ce nom. Lyon, 1572.

any sort of intercourse with a dealer in hydromel.* A genial hospitality was at the same time exercised towards the English nobles by Zegher or Sohier de Courtrai, lord of Dronghen or Tronchiennes, the grandfather of the brewer, if we follow M. Auguste Voisin—or his father-in-law, if we adopt the guidance of Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove. In either case, he is described by Meyer as ‘*equus Flandrus nobilissimus*,’ as a citizen of Ghent, and ‘*baro præcipuus Flandriæ*.’ Jehan le Bel, too, has a good word to say for him, as ‘*ung vaillant che-
valier ancyen qui démeuroit à Gand, et y estoit moult fort
aimé. L’appeloit-on,*’ he continues, ‘*Messire Courtesin, et
estoit chevalier banneret; et le tenoit-on pour le plus preu
chevalier de Flandre, et pour le plus vaillant homme, et qui
le plus vassaument avoit toudis servi les seigneurs.*’ These services were now forgotten, as well as the prowess which had won the honour of knighthood on the field of battle. Like the Van Artevelde, Sohier de Courtrai† belonged to the commercial nobility, and was, consequently, rather popular with the citizens than acceptable to the Count. It is certain that his hospitable reception of Edward’s envoys gave sore umbrage to Louis de Nevers, who invited him to Bruges to attend a general assembly of deputies from the Flemish Communes. The invitation was accepted, but on his arrival the aged knight was treacherously arrested, and conveyed to the Château de Rupelmonde on the Scheldt. In vain did the towns of Flanders implore the Count to release his venerable prisoner, nor was the Duke of Brabant’s intercession a whit more efficacious. The Count also attempted to intercept the English envoys, but they, being timely warned, returned home by way of Holland.

Irritated by the failure of his conciliatory measures, Edward despatched an expedition against Cadzand, a small island lying at the entrance of Sluys harbour, and a favourite station of the French cruisers employed in intercepting English vessels laden with wool. After a stout resistance by the men of Bruges, the Count’s brother was taken prisoner, 500 Flemings were put to the sword, and the place given up to plunder. The loyalty of the Bruges citizens was rewarded by permission to restore the fortifications of their town, which had been partially demolished after the rout at Cassel in 1328. A heavy

* ‘*L’évêque de Lincoln ne dédaigna point de traiter avec ce bourgeois, qui levait contre son souverain l’étendard de la révolte.*’—Hist. des Français, tome x. Paris, 1828.

† Translated by Carte ‘*Lord of Courtesy*,’ vol. iii. bk. x.

fine was at the same time imposed upon the burghers of Ghent, who pleaded earnestly for pardon—their delegates falling on their knees before the Count, whose resentment was to be pacified neither by money nor by submission. Their misery had become almost intolerable. The artisans were reduced to the utmost destitution. Some idea may be formed of the privations they were compelled to undergo by imagining what might have been the condition of the Lancashire operatives during the civil war in North America had there been no poor law to afford relief, and no charitable fund to preserve the semblance of a home for necessitous families. No such aid was forthcoming in Ghent. Not a few of the weaver class emigrated to England, where they were kindly received and enabled to commence life afresh in a foreign land, and where, Michelet assures us, they imparted solidity to the English character, and developed habits of patience, industry, and perseverance. These fugitives settled themselves in the eastern counties, particularly at Worstead in Norfolk, which, indeed, became famous for a particular kind of yarn spun from combed wool. Bands of starving men paraded the streets of Ghent, shouting ‘*Vriheden ende Neeringhen!*’—Liberty and work!—while idle ruffians inspired the peaceful inhabitants with well-grounded alarm, and compelled the white-hooded magistrates to exercise a ruthless severity.

Happily, at that critical moment a rumour went abroad that a rich burgher, a man of foresight and discretion, had been heard to say that he knew a remedy for the existing evils, and that, if his advice were followed, plenty would soon take the place of want. It was Christmas time, but no season of rejoicing for those who were clamouring for bread for their wives and little ones. As usually happens on occasions of enforced idleness, crowds of men out of employment gathered together at the corners of streets and in market-places, when suddenly, as by a common impulse, they began to move in the direction of the Paddenhoek, or Toads’ Corner, saying one to another: ‘Come along—let us hear what this man of wit has to say!’* They found him whom they sought standing with his back to his own door. He listened to their complaints, but reserved his reply for the following day, December 27, 1337, when he invited all who cared to hear him to assemble at the monastery of Biloke. This wise and discreet citizen was named Jacob van Arteveld, generally represented as a seditious

* ‘*Alons, alons oyr le bon conseil du saige homme,*’ is Froissart’s dramatic expression.

fellow, of low extraction, ready to sacrifice king, earl, and country, to enrich and aggrandise himself. It is worth a little trouble to trace this calumny to its origin, and to restore the so-called 'Brewer of Ghent' to his true position in history as a far-seeing statesman and an enlightened disinterested patriot. This article will have been written in vain if the reader does not rise from its perusal with the conviction that to Jacob van Arteveld is justly applicable the eulogy which Clarendon passed upon John Hampden: 'He was, indeed, a very wise man and of great parts, and possessed with the most absolute spirit of popularity, and the most absolute faculties to govern the people, of any man I ever knew.'

Gilles li Muisis, Abbot of St. Martin's monastery at Tournai, who died about the middle of the fourteenth century, says, under the date of 1345—only eight years before his own death—that Arteveld '*regnavit per septem annos, et fuit gubernator et superior totius ville Gantii ac totius patriæ Flandriæ, et ad ejus imperium et voluntatem obediebant, et nihil in dictâ patriâ fiebat sine eo.*' He adds that he was always accompanied by twenty-five to thirty armed men '*fortissimis et ad bella promptissimis.* Et multa mala evenerunt per eum et propter eum.' This small band of followers was increased to sixty or eighty by the Canon Jehan le Bel, who belonged to one of the noblest families of Liège, and died about the year 1370. Describing the ill feeling that existed between Louis de Nevers and the Flemings, he proceeds to remark:—

'Il y avoit ung homme à Gand qui avoit nom Jacques d'Artevelle, et avoit esté brasseur de mies (miel). Celluy Jacques estoit entré en si grande fortune et grâce envers les Flamens que c'estoit tout fait et bien fait quanques il vouloit deviser ou commander par toutes Flandres, de l'ung costé jusques à l'autre; et n'y avoit cil, combien grand qu'il fust, qui osast trespasser son commandement.' *

From the Canon of Liège we may pass at a bound to Sir John Froissart, the authority quoted, directly or indirectly, by nearly all subsequent historians. Several editions of these famous chronicles passed under the hands of their author, and underwent material modifications in the process. The manuscript of Amiens is the oldest and most complete: that of the Vatican includes only the first portion of the series. These manuscripts have been most carefully collated by M. Simon Luce in the great edition of Froissart published by the Société de l'Histoire de France, which far surpasses all its

* Les Vrayes Chroniques de Messire Jehan le Bel, ch. xxvi. Bruxelles, 1863.

predecessors and is a work of great merit. M. Kervyn de Lettenhove, however, relies on the manuscript preserved in the Vatican Library, in which it is written: 'Avoit à Gand un bourgeois qui se nommoit Jaquemon Dartevelle, hauster homme, sage et soutil durement, et fist tant par sa poissance que toute la ville de Gand fu encline à luy et à ses volentés.' It is further said that Van Arteveld was alarmed at the fate of Solier de Courtrai, and was seized with the apprehension that he himself would be the next victim to the Count's jealousy. He therefore made himself master of Ghent, and took care to be always surrounded by a guard of 100 to 120 'varlès tous armés.' His next step was to raise 'une sexste de compagnons en Gand que on nommoit les Blans Caperons, et en fist à tous livrée et estoient bien sys mille, et tous les jours mouteplioient-il et portoient volontiers les blans caperons, car il avoient mieuls titre de faire mal que li aultre qui nul n'en avoient, et n'en portoient nuls se il n'estoit tout fin hors mauvais.'

Attention is particularly requested for the mention of these 'Blans Caperons,' as it furnishes an easy explanation of the character of the guard which waited upon Van Arteveld. That point will be dealt with sufficiently in its proper place, and in the meanwhile it may be convenient to extract Lord Berners' quaint and vigorous rendering of the commonly accepted text of the gossiping old chronicler:—

'In this season (A.D. 1337) there was great dyscorde betwene the erle of Flaunders and the Flemynges; for they wold nat obey him, nor he durst nat abyde in Flaunders, but in great parell. And in ye towne of Gaunt there was a man, a maker of honey,* called Jaques Dartvell, he was entred into such fortune and grace of the people that all thyng was done that he dydde: he might commaunde what he wolde through all Flaunders, for ther was non though he were neuer so great y^t durst disobey his commaundement. He had alwayes goying with hym up and downe in Gaunt LX or fourscore varlettes armed, and amonge them there were thre or foure that knewe ye secretnes of his mynde; so that if he mette a parsonne that he hated, or had hym in suspectyon, incontynent he was slayne; for he had commaunded his secret varlettes, that whannesocuer he mette any persone and made such a sygne to theym, that incontynent they shulde slee hym, whatsocuer he were, without any wordes or resonyng; and by y^t meanes he made many to be slayne, wherby he was so doughted that none durst speke agaynst any thyng that he wolde haue done, so that every man was gladd to make hym good chere. And these

* 'Brasseur de miel;' more correctly translated by Colonel Johnes of Hlafod as 'a man that had formerly been a brewer of metheglin'—mead.

varlettes whan thei had brought hym home to his house, than they shulde go to dyner where they lyst, and after dyner retorne agayne into the strete before his lodgyng, and there abyde tyll he come out, and to wayt on hym tyll souper tyme. These souldyours had eche of them foure grotes flemmyshe by the day, and were truely payd, wekely. Thus he had in euery towne souldyers and seruantes at his wages, redy to do his commaundement, and to espy if ther were any person that wolde rebell agaynste his mynde, and to enfourme hym thereof; and as sone as he knewe any suche he wolde neuer cease tyll they were banysshed or slayne, without respyte. All such great men as knyghtes, squires, or burgesses of good townes as he thought fauourable to therle in any manner, he banysshed them out of Flaunders, and wolde leuey the moyte of their landes to his owne vse, and thother halfe to their wyues and chyl dren, such as were banysshed; of whome there were a great nombre abode at saynt Omers.* To speke properly, there was neuer in Flaunders, nor in none other contrey, prince, duke, nor other that ruled a cuntry so pesably, so long as Jaques Dartvell dyd rule Flaunders. He leueyed the rentes, wynages, and rights that pertained to therle throughout all Flaunders, and spended all at his pleasure, without any accompt makyng; and whan he wold say y^t he lacked money, they beleued hym, and so it behoued them to do, for none durst say agaynst hym; whan he wold borowe any thyng of any burgesse there was none durst say hym nay.'

The portrait stands out clear and palpable, but that it is not the true presentment of Jacob van Arteveld will presently be shown. Moreover, the hands may be the hands of Froissart, but the voice is the voice of Jehan le Bel. The former has amplified and exaggerated the narrative of his predecessor, just as Hume has improved upon the romance of the latter. A contemporary writer, Jan de Klerk, of Antwerp, whose rhymed chronicle has been rendered into modern French by the late M. Octave Delapierre, appears to have expressed himself far more moderately:—

'At Ghent there arose all at once a man who was neither rich nor noble, but who acquired such an influence that very soon the whole country obeyed him. He spoke well, was very courageous, and was named Jacques d'Artavelde. Assisted by numerous partisans, he opposed the Count of Flanders, and was minded to take measures to resist him, as well as Philip of Valois, both of whom hated him mortally. He succeeded in forming an alliance between Edward, King of England, Flanders, Brabant, and the Count of Holland.'

Still more favourable is the evidence of the '*Cronique de Flandres*,' edited by Denis Sauvage. He is there described as '*un homme de la ville de Gand de moult cler engin*,

* These refugees, according to Froissart, were called '*les avolez*;' according to Jehan le Bel, '*les aveulès*,' or '*les oultre avculès*.'

‘qu’on appelloit Jacques de Hartuelde. Cestui avoit esté avec le Comte de Valois outre les mons et en l’Isle de Rhodes, et puis fut varlet de la fruiterie de Messire Loys de France (Louis X.). En après s’en ala à Gand, dont il fut né, et y prit à femme une brasseresse de miel.’

In the first continuation of the Chronicle of Guillaume de Nangis, Jacob van Arteveld is mentioned as the leader of the Flemish insurgents, but it is acknowledged that their object was not to renounce their allegiance to the French king, or even to their own Count, but rather to compel the latter to refrain from his evil ways, and to govern them with justice and equity. It is true that, when Van Arteveld was encamped with Edward under the walls of Tournai, he is spoken of as the captain ‘sectæ Flammingerum pessimæ.’ Similarly, in the second continuation, after an acknowledgment of his eloquence, he is pointed at as ‘iste Jacobus,’ and is accused of attempting to murder a priest, ‘sed Deus, qui suorum est custos obedientium, non permisit.’ As few of the old historians can be quite trusted for dates, it is hard to say whether or not Meyer * was justified in raising Van Arteveld to pre-eminence over his fellow-citizens so far back as 1335, though it is not improbable, as he was evidently a personage of considerable note and influence when Edward’s envoys arrived in Ghent. In any case this is what is said of him:—

‘The men of Ghent were the first, though without the sanction of the Count, to promise assistance to the English, and chose for themselves a tribune and leader in James Arteveld, a brave man and especially distinguished for his eloquence, of gentle rather than of noble blood, who had resided at the Court of the King of the French, and on returning to his own house had taken to wife a woman of some opulence, a maker of mead, and was elected president of the operatives.’

Further on, indeed, he is spoken of as a low-born factious citizen, who gave to the flames the town and country houses of those who had fled with the Count. His civic position will be explained hereafter, but under the date of 1337 he appears as the duly elected and, so to speak, constitutional President of the three great towns, Ghent, Bruges, and Ypres:—

‘The royal power, however, was held in check by three towns of Flanders, who claimed for themselves in all things the supreme military and civil authority, having appointed Arteveld their president and captain. That triad was to Flanders as a senate or a dictator, and the

* *Commentarii sive Annales rerum Flandricarum, autore Jacobo Meyero, Baliolano. Antwerp, 1561.*

whole of Flanders was compelled to obey their decrees and statutes. . . . A few of the nobles also were arrested by Arteveld, whom he kept as hostages, in order to render the nobility less actively hostile to himself.'

Van Arteveld was, in fact, the captain of the civic militia, raised by the chief men of the 'three good towns' to defend their liberties alike against foreign and internal foes. Like Sohier de Courtrai, he belonged to the 'milites burgenses,' who were constantly coming into collision with the territorial nobles, whose sympathies were all with the Count and King, and in whose eyes the burgher community was composed of a turbulent, seditious, insolent rabble. It will have been remarked that he is classed by Van Meyer with those of gentle rather than of noble blood, while his imprisonment, as hostages, of a few members of the baronial order illustrates the difference of political views which separated the military from the commercial aristocracy. It may be observed in this place that Meyer is corroborated by D'Oudegherst* in assigning Van Arteveld's elevation to the year 1335 :—

'Or estoit en ce temps capitaine et grand doyen de ceux de Gand un homme faict et nay à toutes séditions, appellé Jacques d'Artwelde, brasseur, lequel, par ses malicieuses practiques, usurpoit journellement et de plus en plus sur les droictz, prééminences, et autoritez du prince, dont le dict Comte Louys se plaindoit grandement, et signaument de ceux de Gand, entre lesquels et luy yssirent au moyen de ce plusieurs questions et debatx.'

Pierre d'Oudegherst was a native of Lille, a Doctor of Laws, esteemed for his general familiarity with public affairs, and much consulted by reason of his special knowledge of jurisprudence. Naturally enough, a man of his training and peculiar reading, who flourished in the latter half of the sixteenth century, would be unfavourably biassed in treating of a movement which he could only regard as a revolt against the divine right of kings and princes. It is much to be regretted that the majority of the old chroniclers and historians, being for the most part churchmen connected with noble families, were inevitably warped by their early reading and habitual associations, and filled with ineradicable prejudices against all popular movements, and whatever might seem to imperil the existing order of things. It must be confessed, however, that Professor Lesbroussart's footnotes are not less bitter than the text they profess to elucidate, and it may be

* *Annales de Flandre de Pierre d'Oudegherst, par M. Lesbroussart. Gand, 1789.*

that the agitated condition of the neighbouring kingdom of France in 1789 may have disturbed the serenity of the learned commentator. Be that as it may, a still earlier date than is given by Meyer and D'Oudegherst is set forth by a writer who has been a good deal quoted within the last thirty years by local vindicators of Van Arteveld's memory. M. de l'Éspinoy* asserts that it was in 1333 that the Flemings elected as their 'Rewaert, Gouverneur, et Capitaine, un homme très valetueux, sage, et subtil, nommé Jacques d'Artevelde.' In 1337 he confers upon him this high distinction for the second time:—

'There was elected as Captain and Rewaert, or Governor, of Flanders that valiant and wise man, Sire Jacques d'Artevelde, who governed Flanders with much success for seven years seven months and as many days, and who at the outset of his government, with a view to recommend himself the more to the said town of Ghent, said that when he began to build grand mansions and to marry his children to knights and noblemen with golden spurs, it would then be time to distrust him, and to place no more confidence in him.'

If we turn now to Mezeray's 'History of France,'† we shall find it recorded how, in 1336, the Flemings

'governed themselves by the counsels of a certain Jaquemard Arteville, a brewer of beer in the town of Ghent, a man of great strength of mind and body, daring, and ready to commit all sorts of crimes, dreaded by the good because of his cruelties, and followed by miscreants for the sake of the impunity and the largesses with which he gratified the populace, whom he was for ever exciting against the nobility.'

According to this writer, Van Arteveld never ventured abroad without a guard of fifty to sixty armed men. French historians of later times are content to quote Froissart as an unquestionable authority, and tread in one another's steps without the slightest attempt to exercise their critical faculties. Rapin calls Van Arteveld 'a brewer,' and evidently regards him as a mere firebrand. 'The credit of that burgher,' he remarks, 'was so great in Flanders that he had caused the principal cities to revolt against the Earl.' It was excusable in Rapin de Thoyras that he could not enter into the broad, statesmanlike policy sketched by 'that burgher,' but Sismondi might surely have been expected to institute a searching examination into the proofs adduced by his predecessors for the statements they

* Recherche des Antiquitez et Noblesse de Flandres, par Philippe de l'Éspinoy, Viscomte de Therouëne. Douay, 1632.

† Histoire de France depuis Faramond jusqu'au règne de Louis le Juste, par le Sieur F. de Mezeray. Paris, 1685, 2nd edition.

had so glibly propounded. The only liberty, however, he permits himself is to amplify the texts which made a 'common brewer' of Van Arteveld, and to enlarge his business to a scale worthy of a fourteenth century Bass or Allsopp. Let us hear what he has to say:—

'Among the most ardent champions of the public liberties there appeared at Ghent a man endowed with rare talents and, above all, with a great force of character, who succeeded in organising the popular party, in placing himself at their head, and in extending his influence over the two other towns of Bruges and Ypres. He was named Jacquemart or Jacob d'Artevelde. He was the proprietor of a considerable brewery of mead, and his riches, as well as the number of workmen whom he employed, furnished him with the means of making himself feared and obeyed.'

The body-guard of armed ruffians is accepted without hesitation, though, subsequent to Edward's naval victory at Sluys, it is admitted that

'this great citizen, in fact, showed himself superior to the nobles and kings with whom he was called upon to negotiate. However remarkable were the popular eloquence he displayed in rousing the people, and the firmness with which he controlled them, equally great was the breadth of political views he manifested in the councils of two kings, and the valour and military talent he exhibited in the field.'

The conventional lineaments of the burgher-statesman may be encountered in the 'Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique' of Messrs. Chaudon and Delandine:—'Artevelle, ou Artavel, Flamand, brasseur de bière, factieux, éloquent et politique, causa beaucoup de sollicitude au Comte de Flandre'—so much so, indeed, that the Count fled for safety to the court of his overlord. Michelet is another follower of Froissart, for Jehan le Bel is seldom, if ever, quoted, and he apparently fancies himself justified in hazarding the assertion that 'Jacquemart Artavelde,' a brewer of Ghent, organised 'une vigoureuse tyrannie.' He is not, however, far astray where he remarks that 'avec toute sa popularité ce roi de Flandre n'était au fond que le chef des grosses villes, le défenseur de leur monopole.' It is more surprising that M. Dewez, himself a Belgian, should describe Van Arteveld in his 'Histoire Particulière des Provinces Belges,' not only as a brewer, but as an unscrupulous intriguer, subtle and audacious, gifted, indeed, with eloquence, of which he made such use that he raised himself to a bad pre-eminence, comporting himself as a tyrant and oppressor, and displaying a vulgar, insolent luxury. It is true that, in his 'Cours d'Histoire de la Belgique,' he explains how Van

Arteveld came to be attended by armed men when he went abroad. In his capacity of 'doyen des métiers,' or president of the guilds, he was entitled to a guard of 'zweerd-draeghers' or sword-bearers, while, as captain of the city, he would naturally be followed by a detachment of soldiers. This was no new thing, but a custom which existed both before and after his time. A juster view of the great citizen is taken by the compilers of the '*Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*,' in which he is acknowledged to have been connected with the noblest families of West Flanders. Very little, it is added, is authentically known of his youth and early manhood, and that is also the opinion expressed by M. Lenz, Professor of History at the Ghent Athénée, who published in 1837 a thoughtful and well-considered essay on the situation of Flanders at the time of Van Arteveld's accession to power. Of foreign historians none has been so bitter as Villani,* who allows himself to write in the following strain (lib. xi. cap. lxxxiii.) :—

'At last there arose in Ghent a man of humble family and low occupation, who made and sold mead—that is, beer made with honey—whose name was Giacomo Dartivello, and he brought himself to be master of the commune of Ghent. This was in the year 1337; and by his fine speech and frank manners he rose in a short time to such a position and influence through the favour of the common people of Ghent, that he expelled from Ghent the Count and all his followers; and as from Ghent so likewise from Bruges, Ypres, and the other towns of Flanders, they drove out the Count and imprisoned whosoever offered resistance.'

Here again the bodyguard of truculent assassins comes into play, and all the hearsay traditions of the old chroniclers are reproduced as history. Far more moderate and reasonable is the estimate of Van Arteveld's character and position which is given in De Larrey's '*Histoire d'Angleterre, d'Ecosse et d'Irlande*' (Rotterdam, 1707) :—

'Another ally, less considerable by birth, but not so by influence, was the famous Jacques Artevelde, a brewer of beer, who acquired such power over the Flemings that their Count was nothing more than a phantom, all the great towns obeying Artevelde, whose word was absolute. Edward raised no difficulty about negotiating with a man who had made himself arbiter of peace and war in his own country, which its lawful sovereign had abandoned to him by withdrawing to the Court of France.'

The preceding statement is not perfectly accurate, as the Count had not abandoned Flanders at the time when the

* *Cronica di Giovanni Villani. Firenze, 1845.*

English monarch began to negotiate with the citizens of Ghent; neither is it at all certain that Van Arteveld was then actually invested with the guidance of the State. We may now pass, however, to the English chroniclers and historians, who, with the honourable exception of the late Mr. William Longman, have followed Froissart as a flock of sheep follows a bell-wether, though Robert Fabyan's favourable appreciation of Edward's ally might well have made them pause before literally adopting Froissart's picturesque romance. In the 'New Chronicles of Englande and France' (1516) it is written:—

'Kynge Edwarde had so sped his nedys with them (the Flemings) by the meynys of one named Jaques d'Artyuele, a man of Gaunt, which was of great substaunce and passynge other men in boldenesse and capacitye of wytte and dyscressyon that the sayd towne of Gaunt, with Bruges, Ipre, Courtryke or Courtray, Casayle, and other there about condyssendyd * and promysyd ioyntly and hooly to refuse the Frenshe Kynge, and to take the Kynge of Englande's partie, and the rather for the warre which beforetyme Phylp de Valoys made vpon them in the begynnyng of his reygne.'

Grafton is an almost literal translator of Froissart, with whose chronicles Joshua Barnes occasionally commingles Mezeray's history. He describes Jacob van Arteveld as 'a refiner of honey, or rather, as others say, a brewer;' but he admits that, 'by reason of his great wealth, subtle wit, and boldness of mind, he had long been of some authority among the people.' Holinshed, too, evidently sides with the Count as against his rebellious subjects:—

'The Flemings that favoured King Edward were put in such comfort by the late victory obtained by the Englishmen in the ile of Cadsand that, falling to their former practices, one Jaques or Jacob van Arteveld, an honimaker of the towne of Gant, was chosen amongst them to be, as it were, the defender of the people, and namelie of the weavers, and other clothworkers. Finallic, his authoritie grew so hugelie amongst all the whole number of the commons in Flanders, that he might do more with them than their earle, and yet the earle to reconcile the people to his favour ceased not to use all courteous means towards them that he could devise, as releasing customes and duties of moine, pardoning offenses, and other such like, but all would not avail him.'

Thomas Carte relies entirely on Froissart. In dealing with the year 1337 he says that

'there was in Gand a very rich brewer, or refiner of honey, named Jacob van Artweld; of a bold and enterprising genius, exceedingly

* Scotchmen will notice the peculiar sense given to this word by an English writer of that date.

popular, and enabled by his wealth to maintain a guard of eighty men about his person, with a number of soldiers and servants in several towns, to give him intelligence of everything that passed, and to observe the directions he should send for strengthening his interest in the estates of the country, of which he was more master than the count himself. He stuck at no measures of violence against such as would not truckle to his power; having despatched some of the *noblesse*, banished others, and seized their estates: he was by this means become so absolute and terrible that nobody durst contradict whatever he thought fit to propose in the assemblies of the estates of Flanders.'

'It was necessary,' he continues, 'to gain this man,' and the Bishop of Lincoln undertook the task, which could not have been very difficult, seeing that Arteveld was predisposed to the English alliance. Tyrrell also alludes to 'one Jacob van Artefeld, a brewer of that city, who by his riches, boldness, and fluency of tongue, had now, upon the flight of the earl, got the chief authority with the citizens.' Among modern writers the same unanimity exists. Sharon Turner, whose opinion is given for what it is worth, speaks of the 'ambitious brewer,' and, a little further on, of 'the dominating brewer,' while Hume improves upon Froissart. It is really worth while to extract the passages in which this episode is set forth, not merely for the sake of their precision and elegance of style, but as a lesson how history is written by even a past master of the art: * --

'As the Flemings were the first people in the northern parts of Europe that cultivated arts and manufactures, the lower ranks of men among them had risen to a degree of opulence unknown elsewhere to those of their station in that barbarous age; had acquired privileges and independence; and began to emerge from that state of vassalage, or rather of slavery, into which the common people had been universally thrown by the feudal institutions. It was probably difficult for them to bring their sovereign and their nobility to conform themselves to the principles of law and civil government, so much neglected in every other country: it was impossible for them to confine themselves within the proper bounds in their opposition and resentment against any instance of tyranny. They had risen in tumults, had insulted the nobles, had chased their earl into France, and, delivering themselves over to the guidance of a seditious leader, had been guilty of all that insolence and disorder to which the thoughtless and enraged populace are so much inclined, whenever they are unfortunate enough to be their own masters.' †

* History of England by Hume and Smollett, 1834, vol. ii. ch. xv. p. 306.

† See also Hallam: 'The Flemings, and especially the people of Ghent, had been during a century noted for their republican spirit

‘ Their present leader was James d’Arteville, a brewer in Ghent, who governed them with a more absolute sway than had ever been assumed by any of their lawful sovereigns. He placed and displaced the magistrates at pleasure ; he was accompanied by a guard, who, on the least signal from him, instantly assassinated any man that happened to fall under his displeasure : all the cities of Flanders were full of his spies ; and it was immediate death to give him the smallest umbrage : the few nobles who remained in the country lived in continual terror from his violence ; he seized the estates of all those whom he had either banished or murdered : and, bestowing a part on their wives and children, converted the remainder to his own use. Such were the first effects that Europe saw of popular violence, after having groaned, during so many ages, under monarchical and aristocratical tyranny. James d’Arteville was the man to whom Edward addressed himself for bringing over the Flemings to his interests, and that prince, the most haughty and most aspiring of the age, never courted any ally with so much assiduity and so many submissions as he employed towards this seditious and criminal tradesman.’

The gross exaggerations and interpolations with which this passage abounds will appear as the true story of Van Arteveld’s career unfolds itself. The allusion to Edward’s ‘ assiduity ’ and ‘ submissions ’ is a purely fanciful touch intended to heighten the artistic effect of the picture, for, in truth, it was the English monarch who received the lion’s share of whatever advantages accrued from the Anglo-Flemish alliance. Hume failed altogether to realise the true character and policy of Van Arteveld, nor did he clearly understand the nature of the social movement which was beginning its slow development. That generally accurate and painstaking historian, Eyre Crow, calls the great burgher of Ghent ‘ a brewer ’ in his larger work, while in the abbreviated edition prepared for ‘ Lardner’s Encyclopædia ’ he makes him out to be ‘ a brewer of hydromel or ‘ metheglin.’ Nor is Mr. Green better informed on this subject, though aware of M. de Lettenhove’s exposure of Froissart’s inaccuracies. After premising that the democratic spirit of the Flemings ‘ jostled roughly with the feudalism of France,’ he thus proceeds:—

‘ If their Counts clung to the French monarchy, the towns themselves, proud of their immense population, their thriving industry,

‘ and contumacious defiance of their sovereign. Liberty never wore a ‘ more unamiable countenance than among these burghers, who abused ‘ the strength she gave them by cruelty and insolence.’ (Middle Ages, part ii. ch. i.) Compare with these two scathing denunciations of the transition period in Flanders the more kindly and far more thoughtful and just appreciation made by John Lothrop Motley in his ‘ Historical ‘ Introduction ’ to ‘ The Rise of the Dutch Republic.’

their vast wealth, drew more and more to independence. Jacques van Artevelde, a great brewer of Ghent, wielded the chief influence in their councils, and his aim was to build up a confederacy which might hold France in check along her northern border.'

One of two things: if the 'great brewer's' name is to be written in French, it should be Jacques d'Artevelde; if in Flemish, Jacob van Arteveld would be the correct mode. And what is Mr. Green's authority for the epithet 'great' as applied to his business? None of the early chroniclers implies that he was particularly eminent as a tradesman. Mr. Green makes the same mistake as Sismondi, forgetting that the brewers constituted one of the 'petits métiers,' or less considerable guilds, and that it was partly on that account that Van Arteveld, at the height of his power, caused his name to be enrolled in their register as an honorary member. It is somewhat strange that Mr. Green's suspicions should not have been awakened by a footnote in Sir F. W. Eden's valuable work on 'The State of the Poor.' It is there casually mentioned that baking, brewing, and weaving were, at that period, occupations almost wholly monopolised by women, as shown in the feminine terminations bakster, brewster, webster. Women were also millers, and it is within comparatively modern times that in Scotland and the north of England men have applied themselves to brewing—a masculine termination for the conductors of such trades being adopted after they were recognised as masculine employments. It is true that Sir Frederick Eden was treating more especially of England, but there was essentially no difference between the social conditions of France, England, and Flanders in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. That Van Arteveld married a 'brewster,' who may also have been a widow, is quite probable, and would partly account for his choosing in after days to become a member of the Brewers' Guild, in preference to any of the more wealthy and influential 'métiers.' This view is supported by the authority of Nicolaes Despars,* who was a citizen of Bruges in the latter half of the sixteenth century, his preface being dated October 1, 1562. He is decidedly unfavourable to 'Jacob van Aertvelde, die welcke een rijke keysebrowsers 'wedewe ghetraut hadde,' though he commends his courage, ability, and eloquence. According to Everwyn,† Jacob van

* Cronijcke van den Lande ende Graefschcepe van Vlaenderen, gemaect door Jor. Nicolaes Despars. Te Brugge, 1839, vol. i. p. 316.

† Korte Levensschets van Jacob van Artevelde, door Lieven Everwyn. Ghent, 1845.

Arteveld came of an ancient lineage, and his father, a rich 'poorter,' or burgher, retired from business, married a noble damsel, the daughter of Zegher of Courtrai, lord of Dronghen (Tronchiennes). Jacob, he continues, was born in 1295, and was appointed page or 'edelknaep' to Charles of Valois, whom he accompanied in his expedition to Rhodes. He afterwards entered the service of Louis X., and returned to his father's house in 1316. His marriage with a 'brewster,' it is said—but without any authority being adduced—was a source of chagrin to his family, but he himself took kindly to his wife's relations. His name, it is affirmed, does not appear in the contemporary list of brewers, and on the death of his first wife he married Christina van Baronaige, a lady of noble birth. So much for M. Lieven Everwyn, whose researches appear to have been a good deal assisted by a lively imagination. A just and moderate appreciation of Van Arteveld's career was taken by Marc van Vaernewyck, who flourished in the reign of Charles Quint:—

'Sous le valeureux et chevaleresque Jacques van Dartwelle, quoiqu'il eut aussi ses défauts, l'administration et la police de la ville étoient bonnes; jamais la commune de Flandre, si l'on en croit les anciennes annales, ne fut en si grand honneur et en si grande considération.'

This would hardly have been said of the administration of a man who habitually plundered and assassinated those who opposed his will, and set the law at defiance by means of his armed ruffians.

It is time, however, to disabuse our minds of the misconception put upon Jacob van Arteveld's character and proceedings through the ignorance, malice, or carelessness of the ancient chroniclers, whose dramatic narrative has been so heedlessly adopted as trustworthy authority by modern historians. As already stated, the towns of Flanders, like those of Italy, contained two orders of nobility, the feudal and the commercial. The former were territorial barons, while the latter possessed only estates and mansions—after the fashion of retired merchants and manufacturers in our own times and country—though not less ready than the great lords to take the field at a moment's notice, whether at the summons of the Court, or in defence of their communal rights and privileges. The suggestive remark is hazarded by Baron de Lettenhove that the old feudal aristocracy had been used up in foreign expeditions, and especially in the crusades, in which Flemish knights bore a very distinguished part. Members of the Arteveld family, he observes, were for a considerable period châtelains

of Ghent, and possessed vast domains of wood, marsh, and arable land to the north of the town, including the fiefs of Triest, Mendonck, and Ertveld or Arteveld, divided between the different branches. The name occurs in old charters as far back as 1167, but it is worthy of note that there is no record of the family arms. Jacob van Arteveld, indeed, is said to have borne three hoods *argent* on a *sable* shield, though probably for the first time in 1338 or 1340, and evidently in allusion to his office of Captain of the City. His father Jan, or John, was a burgher of good repute, a member of the weavers' guild, and a dealer in broadcloth. In 1324 he was deputed as an envoy to the Duke of Brabant, and thence to Bruges, where he presided at the release of Louis de Nevers, who, for eight months, had been kept under close surveillance by those turbulent citizens. From Bruges he proceeded to Arques, where he conducted certain negotiations with the King of France. In the preceding year he had enjoyed the equivocal advantage of being numbered with the burghers of St. John's parish who were deemed rich enough to be honoured with the privilege of making up a considerable sum of money for the Count's use, his personal contribution amounting to forty livres.

If M. de Lettenhove may be credited, Jacob van Arteveld's mother was named Livine de Groote, the daughter of a highly connected *échevin*, or alderman, of Ghent. Of this marriage were born three sons and two daughters, all of whom were prosperous and successful. Jan, the father, appears to have died about 1328, at which time Jacob was forty-three years of age according to this writer, or thirty-eight if we follow M. Auguste Voisin. There is reason to believe that he accompanied his uncle Walter, who was in the service of Robert de Béthune, when the latter joined the expeditionary force which Charles of Valois led across the mountains into Italy, to assert the rights of his wife Catherine de Courtenay.

During this visit to Italy Van Arteveld may have acquired the germs of the policy which he subsequently developed in his own country. Be that as it may, from Italy Charles of Valois took ship for the Island of Rhodes, where the young Fleming obtained his first experience of the military art. On the return of the French prince to Paris, Van Arteveld entered the service of Louis, commonly called 'le Hutin,' and was appointed to the honourable office of 'varlet de la fruiterie.' In this capacity he waited upon the king at table, offering baskets or dishes of fruit upon bended knee, just as in Germany 'the Count von der Lippe held the basin and Count Bentheim

'poured the rosewater at table over the fingers of the Elector 'of Hesse-Cassel.'* Van Arteveld appears to have remained two or three years at the French Court, and there is nothing improbable in the supposition that it was shortly after his return to Ghent, and whilst he was still a very young man, he married a rich 'brewster,' or, it may be, the widow of a brewer, presumably his senior. On her death he may very likely have taken for his second wife a daughter of Sohier de Courtrai, who, in her turn, may have subsequently entered the illustrious house of Baronaige. In any case, when the great troubles broke out he was chiefly engaged in draining, damming, and cultivating his 'polders' at Basserode, though he also possessed a town house in Ghent on the Calanderberg, in the Padden Hoek, or 'Toads' Corner. From this time a tolerably clear light falls upon the public life of the Flenish statesman, and that he understood statecraft in the highest degree is apparent from the epithet 'subtle' so frequently applied to him.

In their despair the men of Ghent accepted the guidance of their far-sighted fellow-citizen, and on January 3, 1338, they elected five 'hoofdmans,' or captains of the civic militia. To Jacob van Arteveld was given the post of president, or 'belieder van de stad,' his four colleagues being Willem van Vaernewyck, Gelnot van Lens, Willem van Huse, and Pieter van den Hove. A guard of twenty-two 'cnaepen' was assigned to Van Arteveld, twenty to Van Vaernewyck, and a smaller number, sixteen or seventeen, to each of the others. This is the origin of the band of armed ruffians paid by the brewer to work his wicked will. The hoofdmans at once turned their attention to securing the efficient administration of the laws, and with that view came to an amicable understanding with the 'schepenen'—*scabini*, *échevins*—or aldermen of the Keure (the municipal charter or corporation). There was no dismissal of functionaries, and the only alteration made was the transfer of two tax-collectors to other employments. Two days later the 'schepenen' published various ordinances, the enforcement of which they confided to the five captains, assisted by the three principal 'doyens des métiers,' or presidents of guilds. The ancient courts of judicature, and indeed all the old communal offices and usages, were placed on their former footing. Philip of Valois took alarm at these earnest and orderly proceedings, so different from the turbulence which usually characterised the outbreaks of the Ghent people, and lost no time in despatching the Bishop of

* Baring Gould's 'Germany, Past and Present,' vol. i. ch. i.

Cambray to Eclóo to confer with the deputies of the different communes. When the Bishop offered, in the King's name, to throw open all France to their trade, and reminded them that corn and wine abounded in that country, they replied that there was abundance of corn also in Hainault, and that what they wanted was not wine but wool, without which they could purchase neither luxuries nor necessities. Nothing came of that conference; and the magistrates of Ghent, perceiving the futility of looking in that direction for the relief of their industrial population, deputed two of their number to enter into negotiations with Edward's plenipotentiary, the Count of Guelders, then at Louvain. A satisfactory arrangement was soon made. Free passage through Flanders was accorded to the English troops, provided they paid punctually for all goods supplied to them and did no harm to anyone. The rights of the Count of Flanders and of his sovereign, the King of France, were duly recognised; and, in point of fact, the citizens of Ghent pledged themselves to nothing save a strict neutrality, in return for which their deputies were permitted to procure a large quantity of wool from the English staple at Dordrecht.

Though secretly enraged at these proceedings, Louis de Nevers judged it politic to dissemble his feelings, and to sanction what he could not prevent. He summoned Van Arteveld, however, to his presence, who obeyed, but was attended by such a numerous following that the Count deferred his arrest to a more convenient season. It is even said that he contemplated the assassination of the 'belieder van de stad,' and in consequence of a rumour to that effect the magistrates increased Van Arteveld's body-guard to the unprecedented number of twenty-eight 'cnaepen.' On the other hand, Van Arteveld is accused of having slain one Folcard de Roden in the Count's presence; and it is not improbable that such a crime was actually committed, though not by Van Arteveld, who, according to Professor Lenz, was absent from Ghent at that time. In proof of his thorough reconciliation with his 'good town' of Ghent, Louis de Nevers was weak enough to go abroad in the white hood worn by the civic magistrates, but it availed him no more than the Phrygian cap availed Louis XVI. His position became so disagreeable, and even perilous, that he resolved to escape before it was too late to make the attempt. To carry out this project he invited the ladies of Ghent to a banquet, which was to be 'moult riche.' But 'quand il eut ouy sa messe, si dit qu'il vouloit aler voler, puis monta, et s'en ala sans revenir, et ainsi faillit la feste.'

The French King, nevertheless, tried to conciliate the people of Flanders with fair words and goodly promises, with a view to gain time until his plans were matured. On the eve of the great fair known as the 'Lætare,' the streets of Ghent were as usual crowded with holiday folk, when a rumour suddenly spread like fire on a dry prairie, which at first stunned, and then roused to desperation, the terror-stricken citizens. Trustworthy tidings had come that the venerable Sohier de Courtrai had been beheaded in his bed, to which he was confined by sickness and infirmity. On the following day arrived letters from Philip commanding the demolition of the city wall, conformably to the treaty signed by Robert de Béthune; and on the same* day the Bishop of Senlis and the Abbot of St. Denis pronounced in the market-place at Tournai a sentence of excommunication upon the citizens of Ghent. In this crisis Van Arteveld proved himself worthy of the confidence placed in him. He appealed to the Pope, and protested against Philip's usurpation of the Papal prerogative* to hurl the thunderbolts of the Church. He roused the drooping spirits of his fellow-citizens, cowed by superstition, and was by them charged with the defence of the commune, for it was commonly reported that French troops were being concentrated on the frontier. The clergy and monks sympathised with the laity, though forbidden to minister the sacred services of religion. There were no baptismal rites to save from perdition the new-born babe; the holy sacrament of marriage was forbidden; the dead were committed to the earth without a blessing or a prayer. The church bells were silent; public worship was prohibited; the terrors of death were unmitigated by holy unction or the mystic wafer. A gloomy horror overwhelmed the town, and Van Arteveld felt that the path of safety lay in prompt and vigorous action. Refusing to listen to the treacherous overtures made by Philip's envoys at Deynze, and again at Lille, he called out the trained bands, and strove to impart as much organisation and discipline as those self-willed republicans could be induced to receive.

It was well that he had not suffered himself to be cajoled by Philip's specious promises, for on Holy Thursday the Constable of France marched into Tournai at the head of a

* There is a difference of two days in the otherwise consistent narratives of M. de Lettenhove and Professor Lenz. The latter makes Lætare Sunday fall on March 21, while the former makes it fall two days later. The same variance is kept up throughout subsequent events.

formidable army, and two days later was joined by the King in person. Watchmen stationed in the tower of St. Nicholas Church suddenly descried the enemy's skirmishers in the distance, and gave the alarm. The great bell* rang out the tocsin. The townsfolk hastened to their respective posts, and the French horsemen, finding them on the alert, drew off and made for Biervliet, where a large party of feudal nobles had assembled, together with a considerable number of 'Leliaerts,'† fugitives from Cadzand. Summoning the citizens to meet in the 'Canter,' or Place d'Armes, Van Arteveld informed them that he had broken down the bridges at Deynze and its environs, and gave orders that they should be ready on the morrow to accompany him on an expedition against the enemy. Appearing before Biervliet, he routed the Leliaerts and captured the place without much difficulty. It is probable that Philip of Valois would gladly have renounced further hostilities at this juncture, had his opportunism not been frustrated by the headstrong folly of the Count. Entering Bruges with a body of armed men, Louis de Nevers planted his standard in the Grande Place, and demanded the submission of the magistrates. The fullers were the first to recover from their surprise, and bravely attacked the Count's retainers; nor had they long to await support. The citizens flew to arms, drove the Count's people out of the town, and compelled him to seek his own safety within his château at Mâle. From Biervliet Van Arteveld proceeded to Bruges, where he was received with loud acclamations, and a close alliance was concluded between the three good towns, whose deputies then waited upon the Count and related what had passed. Louis de Nevers affected great satisfaction, and swore to maintain the liberties of Flanders in their full integrity.

During the following month of May Van Arteveld and the other deputies traversed Flanders in all directions, labouring to bring about a general confederation, together with a perfect neutrality in the wars of their monarchical neighbours. Edward of England professed his readiness to recognise the

* The great bell called Roelandt, on which were engraven the well-known lines :—

'Ik heete Roelandt; als ik klippe, dan ist brandt;
Als ik luye, dan ist sturm in't Vlaender-land.'

† The French partisans were so named after the fleur-de-lys, while the patriots called themselves 'Liebards,' after the Lion of Flanders, or 'Klawaerts,' from 'Klawen,' a paw.

neutral position of the Flemish communes, and in that spirit addressed a complimentary letter to the magistrates of Ghent. Shortly afterwards he despatched the Bishop of Lincoln, and the Earls of Suffolk and Northampton, to negotiate a new treaty. The English envoys were met at Sluys by the representatives of the communes, and a treaty of commerce was concluded on June 10, 1338, on terms very favourable to the Flemings, who were empowered to buy wool at the English staples in Holland, Zealand, and elsewhere, and to travel or reside in England as freely as in their own country; while the people of Ghent obtained the special privilege of exporting manufactured stuffs, stamped with the city seal, to the English markets without examination of quality or measure. On the other hand, permission was given to English vessels to navigate Flemish waters, provided they remained in no port longer than a single tide, unless under stress of weather, and abstained from landing armed men. The Count, on his part, was left at liberty to engage in whatever wars he pleased, taking with him only his own retainers. Philip of Valois sanctioned this treaty, and in a singularly insolent letter to the magistrates of Ghent accorded a supercilious pardon to the 'rude, simple, ignorant folk' for all their 'meffais ou mespris contre les pais par erreur ou par simplece.' Towards the end of July the Bishop of Senlis arrived in Ghent, and raised the dread sentence of interdict; after which Louis de Nevers, accompanied by the deputies of the communes, repaired to Tournai, to commemorate the Assumption of the Virgin Mary.

Meanwhile Edward had obtained from the Commons a grant of 20,000 sacks of wool, which he expected to find at Antwerp. On his way to that port he entered the harbour of Sluys, where he was met by Van Arteveld, to whose care he is said to have confided his consort, Queen Philippa. He thence prosecuted his voyage to Antwerp, but there was no appearance of the promised wool, and his German allies refused to follow his standard unless assured of their pay. At such an early date did England adopt the pernicious system of fighting her battles with the aid of hirelings. Roused by the difficulties of his position, Edward pushed on into Germany, and prevailed upon the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria to appoint him Vicar-General of the Empire to the left of the Rhine. By virtue of that authority he summoned the imperial vassals to appear in arms in the following July, with a view to undertaking the siege of Cambrai, which commanded the upper course of the Scheldt. At the same time he forbade Philip of Valois

to assume the royal title, and called upon Louis de Nevers and the Flemish Communes to recognise his sovereignty. To this summons they paid no heed, though he offered to bestow in marriage his second daughter, Isabella, upon Louis de Mâle—his eldest daughter, Joan, being now betrothed to the Prince of Castile. Cambrai was at that time the principal city of Flanders ‘under the empire;’ the two other divisions being Flanders ‘under the crown,’ which included the communes under Louis de Nevers as their count, and Philip of Valois as their overlord, and Flanders ‘allodial,’ consisting of the Count’s personal estates and military fiefs. Edward’s aim was to obtain the control of all Flanders in the threefold capacity of Vicar-General of the Empire, claimant of the French crown, and kinsman of the Count. Edward III. had the patience and longanimity of a true statesman; he possessed a quality rare in all ages in kings, and especially so at that period—he could bide his time, and, having sown the seed, could wait till the harvest was ready for the sickle. The treaty recently concluded with the Communes must have been to a certain extent a disappointment, but he was farsighted enough to see that the stars in their courses were fighting on his side, and that he held the key of the future in his own hand. Philip of Valois had nothing to offer in return for the amity of the ‘good towns,’ whereas their prosperity mainly depended on a regular and ample supply of English wool. Under these circumstances Edward wisely resolved to be thankful for small mercies, and his prudence and moderation were speedily justified and rewarded through Philip’s duplicity and over-haste.

While the English monarch was passing the winter in Brabant, without an army, a band of Leliaerts surprised the townlet of Berghem or Bergues, and put to death twenty-five burghers belonging to the opposite faction. They thence proceeded to Dixmude, where they were joined by Louis de Nevers, in the hope of making themselves masters of the place before assistance could arrive from the neighbouring towns. As it happened, the Bruges militia were just then engaged in laying siege to Liedekerke, on the borders of Brabant, but, postponing that enterprise for the moment, they suddenly drew off towards Dixmude, and by the rapidity of their movements anticipated the tidings of their approach. The Count had barely time to mount his horse and gallop off in the dark on the road to St. Omer before the men of Bruges were in possession of his camp. In vain did the Communes protest against the Count’s treachery, and equally in vain did they demand from Philip the restitution of Douai, Lille, and other

chatellanies of which they had been wrongfully dispossessed. Their claims and remonstrances were alike neglected, and the citizens of the Flemish towns became more and more alienated from a sovereign who appeared to take pleasure in withholding from them the justice and protection to which they were entitled. Towards the close of summer Edward led his German auxiliaries against Cambrai, but, obtaining information of Philip's arrival at Peronne, he raised the siege, crossed the Scheldt, and offered battle to his rival. The French king, though his army was superior in numbers, was too wary to commit himself to the fortune of arms unless assured of victory, and towards the end of October fell back to St. Quentin, while Edward found himself constrained to disband his army and retire into Brabant for the winter.

Meanwhile the Flemish Communes proposed to recover possession of Lille, Douai, and St. Béthune, but were foiled by the superior diplomacy of the Count. Inviting them to send deputies to meet him at Courtrai for the purpose of coming to a satisfactory arrangement, he contrived to spin out the negotiations until the English monarch had withdrawn into winter quarters, when they were broken off by his abrupt departure from Courtrai. The French garrisons along the frontier thereupon made frequent incursions into Flemish territory, plundering unvalled towns and hamlets, and inflicting all manner of wanton wrongs upon the rural population. Indignant at the Count's duplicity, the Communes now resolved to transfer their allegiance to Edward III., under certain conditions, and they accordingly sent deputies to Brussels to confer with him upon this delicate subject. Acting as chief spokesman, Van Arteveld laid before him the manifold grievances from which they had so long suffered, and implored his protection against their recurrence. They dared not, he said, openly join the King of England against their sovereign lord, because Popes Clement V. and John XXII. had threatened them with an enormous fine, payable to the Papal see, on pain of excommunication, if ever they proved disloyal to the King of France. That objection would, of course, fall to the ground were Edward to assume that style and title, instead of merely challenging Philip's pretensions as an abstract proposition. After a brief consultation with his council, Edward agreed to quarter the fleurs-de-lys with the arms of England, and caused a seal to be engraved with the motto, 'Dieu et mon droit.' The King then accompanied Van Arteveld to Ghent, whence he proceeded to Antwerp to hold a general assembly of vassals and

allies. Among the archives of Bruges is still preserved the covenant by which the Communes of Flanders accepted Edward III. as their sovereign lord, so long as he respected their 'customs, usages, privileges, and liberties.' On their part they pledged themselves to maintain his lawful claims against all comers, not even excepting 'the illustrious and 'magnificent lord, Philip Count of Valois,' though they took care to leave a loophole for escape, if the need should arise, by stipulating that, in the event of their hereafter discovering a flaw in those claims, they shall be at liberty to acknowledge themselves vassals of the rightful wearer of the crown of France. They also reserved the rights of their Count, Louis de Nevers, to whom they were ready to give due submission in all lawful things, provided that he, on his part, deferred to their ancient rights and privileges, for, said they, 'it ever was, 'is, and will be their intention to lend their aid to the maintenance of peace and tranquillity, and to the leading of an 'honest life, injuring no one, but rendering to each his due.'

It was at Ghent that the arms of England and France were first seen quartered upon the same shield, the prelude to a hundred years of war and misery, and to centuries of mutual jealousy and distrust between two nations who might so easily and naturally have been fast friends and allies. From that city also issued Edward's first public deeds and ordinances as King of France. On January 26, 1340, three charters were granted by Edward 'King of France and England to the 'inhabitants of the good towns of Ghent, Bruges, and Ypres, 'and of the common land of Flanders, in consideration of their 'very great loyalty, goodness, obedience, and services'—reasons founded on hope rather than on memory. By the first he undertook to establish a staple or mart in Flanders or Brabant; to sanction the free import into England of all kinds of woollen manufacture stamped with the seal of either of those provinces; to concede to the Flemings resident in England the rights and privileges of native-born subjects; to conclude no treaty of peace with Philip of Valois without their knowledge and consent; and to protect Flemish vessels against the cruisers of all other nations. By the second charter, Edward bound himself to assemble his naval forces to sweep the Channel clear of French war-ships and pirates; to place on board a large contingent of combatants raised in Flanders and Brabant, but paid from the English treasury; to pay to the Communes a sum of 140,000*l.* sterling, by four equal instalments; and to fix the wool-staple at Bruges for fifteen years. The third charter was apparently still more

liberal, though the people of Flanders were not destined to reap much benefit from it. The King of England and France renounced all pretensions to Lille, Douai, Béthune, and Orchies, and restored to Flanders the county of Artois and the town of Tournai. He declined to be in any way indebted for his authority to the Pope, and resigned for ever the prerogative of launching interdicts. He promised never to interfere with the walls and fortifications of Flemish cities, or to impose taxes or duties in any form. Finally, he engaged to introduce a common gold and silver currency for France, England, Flanders, and Brabant. Through the immediate influence of Van Arteveld a close alliance had already been contracted between Flanders and Brabant, by which their respective lords were forbidden to make either war or peace without the assent of the two peoples.

Free trade between the two States was secured, a common currency was agreed upon, and no commercial changes were to be introduced without mutual consent. In the event of disputes and differences occurring, the point at issue was to be referred to a council of ten, of whom four members were to be nominated by the Duke of Brabant and the Count of Flanders, and the six others by the Communes of Louvain, Brussels, Antwerp, Ghent, and Ypres. Thrice in the year the two great lords and deputies from the six towns were to meet, in turn, at Ghent, Brussels, and Alost, to take counsel together and remove all obstacles to the smooth and efficient working of the compact. This act of union was signed by eighty barons, knights, and deputies, and a little later the Count and Communes of Hainault signified their adhesion. A confederation of the States of Flanders, Brabant, and Hainault, a parliament in which the democratic element held its own against ancient feudal associations and prejudices, the independence of the Communes, the integrity of their territory, free trade, a fixed common currency, industry and commerce undisturbed by foreign ambition and intrigues—such was the policy of Jacob van Arteveld. A man who, in the middle of the fourteenth century, could conceive and execute such a farseeing programme, was no factious, seditious, self-seeking demagogue, but an enlightened and patriotic statesman. If the arrangement proved premature and ephemeral, it was because the assassination of Van Arteveld destroyed the mainspring of the delicate mechanism, and there was no one to supply his place.

Completely dependent on France, Pope Benedict XII. addressed a peremptory letter to the Flemings, enjoining them

to remain loyal to their sovereign prince, and reminding them of the disasters that had befallen them whenever they had striven to wrench themselves asunder from France. A Flemish lord of large possessions and considerable personal distinction accordingly proceeded to Avignon to notify to the Holy Father that the Communes now recognised the sovereignty of Edward III., who had formally renounced his prerogative of interdict, and to crave the cancelment of all clauses in previous treaties which recognised that right in the wearer of the French crown. Nothing came of that incident, and it is uncertain if the envoy was even admitted to an audience. About the same time, however, the Pope wrote to the King of England, repudiating his pretensions, and warning him to place no confidence in his Flemish and German auxiliaries, who would serve under him no longer than suited their own immediate interests. Edward's reply, dated from Ghent, February 8, set forth his claim to the throne of France, and affirmed his intention to restore to the Communes the charters they enjoyed under Louis IX., to renounce the right of arbitrarily imposing taxes, and under no circumstances to tamper with the coinage. He further alluded to his great desire to deliver the Holy Land out of the hands of the unbelievers, and concluded by demanding the homage of every Frenchman, whether of high or low degree, before the forthcoming festival of Easter, on pain of being dealt with as a rebel and a traitor. He then crossed over to his own dominions, but leaving Queen Philippa in Ghent, where she gave birth to the famous John of Gaunt, 'time-honour'd Lancaster,' and in the preceding year Lionel, Duke of Clarence, had been born at Antwerp. It is related that Katharine of Courtrai, wife of Jacob van Arteveld, being confined about the same time, her child was held at the font by the Queen of England, and named after her Philip. This was he whose brief career terminated at Roosbeke.

A fresh sentence of excommunication was launched on April 4, 1340, against the people of Flanders by the Bishop of Senlis, assisted by the Abbot of St. Denis, but Edward lessened the effect of this blow by sending over English priests, who officiated in the Flemish churches without regard to Benedict's displeasure. That same evening a large body of men-at-arms, supported by a strong detachment of crossbowmen, sallied forth from Tournai, and ravaged the country as far as Berghem, when they were suddenly attacked by Van Arteveld at the head of the Ghent militia, and were driven back in headlong flight to whence they came. That valiant leader now summoned the men of Ypres to join

him in laying siege to Tournai, but unhappily they turned aside, under the Earls of Salisbury and Suffolk, to punish the Genoese garrison of Armentières. Emboldened by their success in this enterprise, they thought to carry the important town of Lille with equal facility. Pushing forward without order or discipline, they fell into an ambuscade, and were either cut to pieces or taken prisoners—among the latter were the two English earls. In consequence of this misadventure Van Arteveld was constrained to abandon his designs upon Tournai, and to return to Ghent. Shortly afterwards, however, he again took the field at the head of 60,000 armed citizens, and, marching to the aid of the Count of Hainault, compelled the French under the Duke of Normandy to raise the siege of Thun l'Evêque, gallantly defended by two brothers of Sir Walter Manny.

While the men of Ghent and their captain were absent on this expedition, Edward III. won a brilliant victory over the French fleet in the harbour of Sluys, when 3,000 of the enemy perished by the sword or by drowning. A great slaughter is said to have been made by the mariners of Bruges, who sailed down the Damme canal and fell upon the rear of the French, already disordered by the impetuous attack of the English. The King, though severely wounded, hastened to Bruges, where he asked after his 'compère' Jacob van Arteveld, and was told that he was at that moment warring in defence of the territory of Hainault. Accepting the freedom of the town of Bruges, Edward went on to Ardenberg, where he was met by his 'gossip,' who had been doing good service to his cause at Valenciennes by expatiating in the market-place, with commanding eloquence, upon his title to the crown of France. 'Singulari vir facundiâ' is the tribute extorted from the reluctant Meyerus, while Froissart relates that 'he dyde so by his great wysdome and 'pleasant wordes, that all people that harde hym praysed hym 'moche, and sayd howe he had nobly spoken and by great 'experyence. And thus he was greatly praysed, and it was 'sayd y^t he was well worthy to govern ye countie of Flaunders.' Froissart, by the way, misplaces Van Arteveld's oratory at Valenciennes, which he makes posterior to the naval battle at Sluys, and represents Edward as being present and exhibiting a generous hospitality.

From Ardenberg, where the King celebrated a thanksgiving for his great victory, they rode together to Bruges to take counsel with the deputies of the Communes. The Flemings insisted that Edward should commence hostilities

with the siege of Tournai, which had been wrongfully torn from Flanders by Philip the Fair, and promised to co-operate with a contingent of 100,000 men under their Ruwaert, Jacob van Arteveld, besides raising a second army of 50,000 men to serve in the Artois under Count Robert, at whose pernicious instigation Edward had originally been induced to put forth his claim to the kingship of France. This vast host of militia received no pay, either from the King or their respective Communes, but kept the field at their own charges. Within five days Van Arteveld had taken the road to Tournai with 40,000 men, who were largely reinforced as the siege went on. Several vigorous assaults were given by the Flemings, all of which were successfully repulsed. For the first time the Communes made use of cannons called Ribaudequins, which threw heavy stones, but no progress was made, and at length the siege was converted into a blockade. Flying columns of English soldiers and Flemish militia laid waste the country as far as Lens and Lille, while Philip of Valois lay quietly encamped at Aire. After a time he moved to the bridge of Bouvines—a name of evil omen to Flanders—and took up a strong position, whence he could observe the enemy without being forced to give battle at a disadvantage. Impatient at his ill success, Edward challenged his rival to single combat, but Philip was far too wise to leave to chance what he was sure to obtain by sagacity. Thoroughly worn out by their idle labours and sufferings, both the English and Flemish leaders gladly accepted the mediation of Jeanne de Valois, sister to the King of France and mother of the Count of Hainault. The siege had dragged on through seventy-four days, when, on September 25, a truce was agreed upon, to last until the festival of St. John the Baptist in the ensuing year, 1341. There is some reason to believe that the two kings would willingly have made peace with one another without taking much account of the Flemings, but Van Arteveld asserted himself so strongly that in the end the Truce of Espiechin was more favourable to the Communes than to the other belligerents. Philip thereby renounced for himself and his heirs for ever the right of excommunicating the people of Flanders, discharged all fines and obligations that were hanging over them, and even consented that no Leliaerts should be permitted to return to their homes without the previous sanction of the opposite party which happened for the moment to be in power.

On October 7 Van Arteveld rendered an account of his conduct before Tournai to his fellow-citizens assembled in the

principal market-place, and received their hearty approval. The magistrates then tore down the bulls and sentences of excommunication that had been posted up in different parts of the town, and cut them into shreds with scissors. Louis de Nevers, as usual, ratified all that had been done, and professed entire satisfaction. The English monarch, on his part, was then in great straits for money. Through the mediation of Van Arteveld he obtained from the Communes a loan of 50,000 marks, but was warned by the Counts of Hainault and Guelders not to trust too implicitly to his friends at Ghent, who were quite capable of seizing his person and handing him over to Philip in return for certain valuable considerations. His presence in England was, moreover, so urgently required that he went off secretly to Sluys, and, after encountering a severe storm, arrived in London unexpectedly at midnight, in time to baffle the machinations of his enemies. The Truce of Esplechin was ultimately prolonged to June 24, 1342; but in the month of August, 1341, the Flemings again advanced to the French frontier, and came in sight of the French army not far from Gravelines. There they halted in expectation of being shortly joined by their English allies, but as these made no sign of coming to their aid, the magistrates of Ghent deputed Van Arteveld's wife, Katharine of Courtrai, to proceed to London with great powers, in the hope that Edward's chivalrous gallantry might be roused on their behalf.* The lady was received with all possible respect, and every morning at her *reveillée* the King's musicians played beneath her windows 'in honour of 'the land of Flanders.' Edward himself, however, had crossed over into Brittany, whither Katharine followed him. Being wrecked off Brest, she took horse and rode off to the English camp, where she encountered a sister of Louis de Nevers, who had espoused the English cause with 'the courage 'of a man and the heart of a lion.' Though treated with great deference, the illustrious representative of Flanders does not appear to have sped in her mission, and the Flemish

* According to Froissart, Van Arteveld, on a previous occasion, was sent to England with some other deputies and lodged in the 'Rue de 'la Réole.' The King and Queen were then at Eltham, whither the envoys proceeded, and were entertained at dinner. Great attention was paid to Van Arteveld, who acted as spokesman, and obtained a promise that a wool-mart should be established in Flanders. This promise was ratified by the King's Council at Westminster, and a large supply of wool was at once forwarded to Sluys, Damme, and Bruges.

militia only escaped from their perilous position by giving in their adhesion to the prolongation of the Truce of Esplechin.

On November 9 Louis de Nevers met the deputies of the Communes at Damme, near Bruges, and in a sort of parliament strongly exhorted them to repudiate the English alliance, and return to their ancient allegiance to Philip of Valois. Failing in this attempt, the Count is accused of entering into a plot to overthrow the commercial aristocracy, trusting to the co-operation of the lower orders, always jealous of those immediately above them. The three 'good towns' had extorted from the Count a charter which conferred upon them the exclusive monopoly of weaving, to the prejudice of the small towns. The artisans, thus deprived of their livelihood, naturally demurred to such selfish and high-handed proceedings, and at Ardenberg flew to arms. At this critical juncture Van Arteveld displayed his usual promptitude, and, hastening to the seat of disturbance, slew with his own hand one Peter Lammens on the threshold of his own house—'probum ac nobilem virum,' as he is described by Meyer. This act of violence for a moment shocked and alarmed his followers, till he bade them enter the house, where they would find a sufficient proof of the dead man's treachery. They rushed in and found a banner—probably the banner of a weavers' guild—whereupon indignation gave place to admiration, and they warmly applauded the deed which at first they were disposed to blame. Unhappily, episodes of this kind are only too frequent in the annals of Flanders, and to a certain extent excuse Hallam's harsh appreciation of those sturdy democrats. Louis de Nevers became alarmed for his own safety, and in the first week of 1342 fled to the Court of France.

It is now time to consider the principles by which Van Arteveld was guided in his administration of Flanders. Even his enemies admit that during the seven years and seven months of his supremacy the country attained to a degree of wealth, prosperity, and influence, which it had never before enjoyed. It is open, indeed, to doubt whether he nominally held the office of Ruwaert,* but there can be no question that he was virtually commander-in-chief of the Flemish militia, and president of the three good towns of Ghent, Bruges, and Ypres. In this capacity he prohibited all tampering with the currency, and caused a canal to be dug from Ghent to Damme, by means of which water communication could be maintained with England. The owners of the lands thus appropriated to the

* From 'Ruhe warten,' to keep the peace: *Anglicè* 'ward' or 'warden.'

public service were handsomely compensated, and from the manner in which this fact is mentioned by M. L'Espinoy it may be inferred that such considerateness was unusual in those days. It is said that Flanders was now divided into three military circles, and it may be that what was previously a common understanding was now, for the first time, definitely arranged; but it is certain that the three good towns had long arrogated to themselves the right of imposing their will on the other communes, and of regulating at least the foreign relations of the whole country of Flanders. It is further stated that, for military purposes, the town of Ghent was marked out into 250 sections in order to facilitate the assembling of the trained bands to meet a sudden emergency.

Another innovation is attributed to Van Arteveld, though M. Vanderkindere disputes his claim to originality, and shows, almost conclusively, that he merely revived and modified an old arrangement. It is, however, commonly averred that Van Arteveld divided the citizens of Ghent into three classes, the 'poorterye,' the 'weverye,' and the 'neeringhen.' The 'poorters' were wealthy burghers, sons or descendants of men who had retired from business, and exercised a large hereditary influence with a conservative tendency. The 'weavers,' whose numbers have been estimated at 40,000 men, depended upon the maintenance of peaceful relations with all their neighbours, especially with the English, from whom they drew almost entirely their supply of the raw material. Their political principles were of a democratic and revolutionary order, at the same time that they stoutly asserted their own monopoly, as shared with their brethren of Bruges and Ypres, to the prejudice of the smaller towns. The 'neeringhen' comprised all other industries, with the exception of the fullers, and had made themselves notorious for their wild excesses and tumultuous outbreaks. But here we are met by the obvious objection that no mention is made of the fullers, whose rivalry with the weavers was frequently illustrated by violence and bloodshed. In this difficulty M. Vanderkindere adduces cogent reasons for believing that Van Arteveld struck out the 'poorters' from the municipal council, and conferred the total magisterial authority and civic government upon the three classes actually engaged in trade, commerce, and industry, represented in council by their respective 'dekenen,' or 'deacons.' As the 'neeringhen' consisted of fifty-two 'petits métiers,' including the brewers, the council would have been swamped, had each of these deputed its 'deacon' to the governing board. It was consequently ruled that these fifty-two 'dekenen' should elect an 'euver-

‘deken,’ whose position should be similar and equal to that of the masters of the two principal guilds. The ‘poorters,’ to preserve their local influence, now inscribed themselves members of one or other of these fraternities. Van Arteveld, for obvious reasons, chose the Brewers’ Guild,* and was at once elected their ‘deken,’ and straightway the other ‘dekenen’ unanimously made choice of him as their ‘cuverdeken.’ In this capacity he was entitled to a guard of ‘swert draegers,’ or swordsmen, clothed in red tunics, with stripes on their sleeves. There seems to have been a re-election of captains in 1342, when the popular choice again acclaimed Jacob van Arteveld as their chief hooftman, giving him as colleagues ‘Willem ‘van Vaernewijc, Gelloet van Leins, Pieter van Candenhove, ‘and Joos Hapere,’ of whom, notwithstanding a slight difference in the spelling of the names, the last only was a new man.

In that same year lamentable disturbances broke out at Poperinghe. Although Louis de Nevers, probably under coercion, had conferred the monopoly of the cloth manufacture upon Bruges, Ghent, and Ypres, he is accused of secretly instigating the citizens of the excluded towns to resent this privilege, and to contravene his own charter. The weavers of Poperinghe thus drew down upon that place the jealous wrath of the favoured citizens of Ypres, who fell furiously upon the town, slew many of its inhabitants, and destroyed all the cloth-loom in the adjacent hamlets. A riot in the following year took place in Ghent, where Jan Steenbeke accused Van Arteveld of violating his oath and aiming at a military dictatorship. Van Arteveld denied the charge with vehemence, and would have slain his accuser on the spot, had he not fled to his own house, in which he was besieged by members of at least thir-

* The ‘Memorie-Boek der Stadt Ghent’ and the Vicomte de Théroutenne describe this incident in identical terms, the one in Flemish, the other in French. They both express themselves to the following purport:—‘The said Jacques d’Artevelde, although he was ‘of gentle birth and of noble extraction, to stand better in the favour ‘of the people who had raised him, chose and selected a guild, which ‘was that of the brewers, not that he followed that business, but to ‘enjoy its privileges and immunities, and was elected the first *souverain deken* (or *doyen-souverain*) of the said town, where he was ‘much loved and esteemed: in which he was followed by several other ‘noblemen of the town, in order to be in favour with the people, and ‘in the hope of attaining that dignity and office of *souverain-doyen*; ‘and through this it is that Messer John Froissart and other historians ‘write that the said Jacques d’Artevelde was a brewer—not being cognisant of his person or quality.’

teen, perhaps of twenty-six guilds. The magistrates, however, intervened, and restored tranquillity by confining Van Arteveld in the prison, known as that of Gerard the Devil (*Gerards dievels steen*), while Steenbeeke was carried off to the Graevensteen, or Count's prison. Armed men crowded into Ghent from all the country round, but the civic authority was so firmly established that a regular enquiry was instituted, which resulted in Van Arteveld's release, and in the banishment of his adversary and fifty-two of his partisans—exclusive, says Meyer, of a '*matrona quædam honesta*.'

A far worse business than this was the great fight in the Friday market-place, on Monday, May 2, 1345, between the weavers and the fullers. The latter, it is said, demanded higher pay for their labour, which was refused in such a manner that they flew to arms. The real motive of this civic commotion is very obscure, but apparently it had more to do with mutual jealousy than with a difference about the value of their services. The mad fury with which the battle was fought attests a deeper and fiercer animosity than could have been engendered by a dispute about a groat a day more or less. In vain did the priests endeavour to separate the combatants by carrying aloft the consecrated Host. Neither weavers nor fullers cared, at such a moment, for the ministers or symbols of religion. The contest only ceased when the fullers gave way and fled, leaving their deacon and fifteen hundred of their number dead upon the market-place. The deacon of the weavers was Gérard Denys, a personal friend of Van Arteveld, to whom he was mainly indebted for the distinction he had attained, and who bravely fought by his side throughout that untoward strife. The day was appropriately named '*den quaden Maendag*,' bad or unlucky Monday; and the supposition is not altogether unfounded which dates from that slaughter the ill-feeling that ere long proved fatal to Van Arteveld. His conduct on that occasion must necessarily have alienated the fullers and their partisans among the '*petits métiers*,' who, we are told, had grown weary of the English alliance, which implied the supremacy of the weavers' guild. On the other hand, it may be assumed that, after the battle was fought and won, the chief of the State would exert himself to save the vanquished from the malice of the victors, and by so doing would give umbrage to the latter, and provoke the jealousy of their leader and head-man. Very little, however, is known of the internal condition of Ghent between 1342 and 1345, and this for a reason which will presently appear.

In the first week of July, 1345, Edward III. once more anchored in the Zwyn, or harbour of Sluys. He was accompanied by a numerous fleet, either for protection or in furtherance of a scheme to convert the county of Flanders into a dukedom, with the Prince of Wales as its liege lord. Whether this project was first conceived by the English king, or by his 'gossip,' Jacob van Arteveld, is somewhat uncertain, nor is it a matter of much moment; but it is probable that it was engendered in the subtle brain of the 'Brewer of Ghent.' Be that as it may, Edward received the deputies of the chief communes on board his great ship, the 'Katherine,' and submitted for their consideration the programme above mentioned. The discussion terminated in the deputies expressing a wish to refer the question to their respective constituents, as they had no authority to decide an affair of such grave importance. It is plain, however, that the proposition, though warmly supported by Van Arteveld, was not generally acceptable. Although no reluctance had been manifested to transfer their allegiance from Philip to Edward, provided the latter succeeded in making good his claim to the French crown, strong repugnance was shown to renounce the lordship of a fellow-countryman in favour of a foreigner who would almost necessarily be an absentee. The council was accordingly adjourned until fuller instructions could be obtained, and, if Froissart may be trusted, Van Arteveld persuaded the citizens of Bruges and Ypres to fall in with Edward's views. In Ghent, however, he was opposed by Gérard Denys, the deacon of the weavers' guild, described by Meyer as a factious fellow and fond of revolutionary changes—'hominem factiosum ac novarum rerum cupidum.'

While Van Arteveld, presuming on his influence with the men of Ghent, postponed his return until he had won over the two other 'good towns,' Gérard Denys made such excellent use of the advantage thus carelessly thrown in his way that the artisans began to distrust their great captain, and to suspect him of selfish and ambitious designs. According to Sismondi, the Duke of Brabant secretly fostered these doubts, and filled their minds with disquietude, for no better reason than that he desired to betroth his daughter to the Count's son, afterwards Louis de Mâle. When the unwelcome tidings reached Van Arteveld that his own townsmen had turned against him, he is accused of having obtained from the King of England the support of a small body of 500 Welshmen, under Sir John Maltravers, with whose assistance he undertook to slay his rival and compel the people to submit to the new order

of things. It is further stated that Gérard Denys, having received information that these troops were lying in ambush near one of the gates, called the burghers to arms, and effectually prevented their entrance. Another account, however, actually introduces these 500 men by night into Van Arteveld's house, and states that seventy of them were killed in the subsequent riot. In the first place, it is very unlikely that, with the remembrance of the recent and terrible fight in the Friday market-place, Van Arteveld would imagine that he could overawe such a turbulent and bellicose population by a handful of light-armed and ill-disciplined troops such as Fluellen's countrymen are known to have been in those days. Secondly, it is quite conceivable that the report may have been circulated and believed that English soldiers were either within the walls or at no great distance from them, because a small body of archers seems really to have been disembarked at Sluys with the intention not of marching upon Ghent, but of aiding the communes to recover Termonde, or Dendermonde, which had been surprised by the Count, and was then in his possession. These archers may very well have obtained early intelligence of the tragedy which had been enacted at Ghent, and may have been the first to convey the unwelcome news to Sluys, without having either entered or approached that town.

The circumstances attendant on the death of Jacob van Arteveld have been succinctly and simply described by Jehan le Bel, and greatly amplified and embellished by Sir John Froissart. The former, indeed, enters into no particulars, but represents the fullers as the assailants. The people of Ghent, he continues, then chose a new governor, whose name was Gérard Denis, 'a cloth-maker.' Gilles li Muisis is equally reticent, except that he asserts that Van Arteveld's wife had taken a large amount of treasure into England. That the lady was in England at the time is not improbable, as she had been sent thither by the magistrates to press Edward for repayment of the money he had borrowed from the town; but the 'Memorie-Boek' distinctly shows that Van Arteveld died comparatively poor, having expended his once considerable resources in furtherance of his political schemes. There is nothing in Froissart more picturesque than his description of the last hours of the great burgher:--

'Whan he retourned (from Sluys) he came into Gaunt about noone; they of the towne knew of his comyng, and many were assembled toguyder in the strete where as he shoulde passe, and whane they sawe hym they began to murmure and began to run togyder, thre heades in one hood, and sayde, beholde yon great maister, who woll order all

Flaunders after his pleasure, the whiche is nat to be suffred. Also, their were wordes sown through all ye towne, howe Jaques Dartveill had ix yere assembled all the revenewes of Flaunders without any count gyven, and therby hath kept his estate; and also send great rychesse out of the cuntry into Englande secretly. These wordes set them of Gaunt on fyre; and as he rode through the strete he parceyvved that ther was some newe mater agaynst hym, for he saw suche as were wonte to make reverence to hym as he came by, he sawe theym tourne their backs towarde hym, and entre into theyr houses; then he began to doute; and as sone as he was alyghted in his lodgyng he closed fast his gates, doores, and wyndose; this was skante done but all the strete was full of men, and specially of them of the small craftes; ther they assayled his house bothe behynde and before, and the house broken up; he and his within ye house defended themselfe a longe space, and slewe and hurt many without; but finally he coude nat endure, for thre partes of the men of the towne were at that assaut.'

Then follows a purely imaginary report of a pathetic speech addressed to the infuriated mob from a window, and which was emphasised by 'sore wepyng' not at all in harmony with Van Arteveld's bold, soldier-like temperament. Finding that prayers and entreaties availed nothing—

'he drewe in his heed, and closed his wyndowe, and so thought to steale oute on the backsyde into a churche that ioyned to his house, but his house was so broken that IIII hundred persons were entred into his house; and finally ther he was taken and slayne without mercy, and one Thomas Denyce gave hym his dethe stroke.'

According to Sismondi his brother and nephew were slain at the same time, but writers differ considerably as to the individual who actually struck the fatal blow. In the first edition of Froissart, Van Arteveld's death is ascribed to Thomas Denis, whom he had caused to be elected 'doyen des telliers.' Tyrrell, however, affirms that he was killed by a man whose father he had hanged. M. Kervyn de Lettenhove, again, makes mention of a cobbler named Thomas Denis, whose father had fallen by Van Arteveld's hand, perhaps on 'den quaden Maendag;' but Mezeray asserts that Thomas Denys was a saddler, while Meyer says that Van Arteveld was killed in the stables by a 'sutore' 'veteramentarium' to avenge his father's death. Holinshed is uncertain whether it was Thomas Denis or a cobbler who clove his skull with an axe, after following him to his stables, whither he had gone for a horse; but the most purely fanciful narrative is that given in De Larrey's '*Histoire d'Angleterre, d'Ecosse, et d'Irlande*,' where it is written that the Flemish deputies had agreed to accept the Prince of Wales as successor to Louis de Nevers, provided he took for his consort the Count's daughter, but that, after they had dispersed to their respective towns, the men of Sluys rose and 'massacrèrent cet odieux chef de parti

‘qu’ils regardaient comme un tyran et comme un traître.’ This deed was perpetrated in Edward’s presence, who thereupon set sail and returned to his own country, vowing vengeance on the murderers of his gossip, but was subsequently appeased. Had anything of the kind been attempted at Sluys while the English fleet lay there at anchor, it is quite certain that it would have been punished with terrible severity. It is true, however, that Edward immediately returned to England, and was afterwards pacified by a deputation from the three ‘good towns.’ In the pathetic words of Froissart, ‘ainsi fut entr’oublée ‘petit à petit la mort de Jacques d’Artevelle.’

It is commonly stated that his house was demolished, and it may very likely have been wrecked and plundered; but it appears from the ‘Jaer-Registre’ (*blad* 37), quoted by the Chevalier Diericx, that it was still standing in 1371. It is probable that, instead of returning to his own dwelling-house, Van Arteveld took refuge in a house known as late as A.D. 1450 as ‘de ‘Cancellery,’ partly to destroy any papers, if such there were, of a compromising character, and partly because his guard would naturally be stationed at his public office, and no mention is anywhere made of his four sons or his daughter being assailed or threatened. In any case, not a single document pertaining to his seven years’ administration is forthcoming, to which circumstance may be largely due the misconceptions that have prevailed to his sore prejudice. His body appears to have been buried in the monastery at Biloke, where he is said to have first uttered words of wisdom and encouragement to his desponding fellow-citizens. When tranquillity was restored, Van Arteveld’s family were induced to pardon the authors of his death in consideration of a certain payment, known as ‘de ‘zoene,’ which was still in force in 1371, when Wautier de Mey compounded for his share in the foul work of July 24, 1345, by founding an expiatory lamp before the image of the Virgin, which is known to have been burning in 1375. We are told by M. Voisin how, in 1835, a merchant of Ghent, by name Van Ooteghem, built a house, Place de la Calandre, No. 16, on the site of Van Arteveld’s residence, with an immense balcony along the front of the first floor, to which was affixed a copper plate bearing the following inscription from the pen of M. Voisin :—

ICI PÉRIT,
VICTIME D’UNE FACTION,
LE XXIV JUILLET MCCCXXXV,
JACQUES VAN ARTEVELDE,
QUI ÉLEVA LES COMMUNES DE FLANDRE
À UNE HAUTE PROSPÉRITÉ.

In 1837, at the opening of the Ghent railway station, the lowest depth of bathos was reached by conferring this illustrious name on a locomotive, while in 1848 a second-rate *estaminet* occupied the site of the famous house on the Calander-berg. It may be here noted for what it is worth that Gérard Denys was killed by some of Louis de Mâle's men in the market-place only three years after the death of Jacob van Arteveld, while the weavers shouted for the commune and the King of England. Louis de Nevers had fallen at Crécy on the memorable 26th of August, 1346.

After all, it is quite possible that there may have been two individuals, respectively named Gérard and Thomas Denis, or Denys, and that the fatal blow may have been struck by Thomas, the 'doyen' of the 'telliers'—a misprint for 'selliers,' or saddlemakers. The commotion was very likely the handiwork of Gérard Denys, through jealousy of the great 'hooftman;' but without any premeditated design against his life. In any case the investigation into the tumult was instituted through his influence, and the result was his own appointment to the office previously held by Jacob van Arteveld.

ART. IV.—*Endymion*. By the Author of 'Lothair.' Three vols. London: 1880.

WHATEVER points of difference we may have on political subjects from the Earl of Beaconsfield—and they are both numerous and broad—we have never ceased to feel respect and sympathy for the genuine love of letters which has marked the whole career of the author of 'Lothair.' 'Born in a library, and trained from early childhood by learned men who did not share the passions and the prejudices of our political and social life' (to borrow his own description of his early years in the preface to 'Lothair'), Lord Beaconsfield has shown on more than one occasion that he can withdraw with perfect serenity and self-reliance from the lists of public strife, where he has run so many courses and unhorsed so many antagonists, to the seclusion of literary retreat; there he calls about him the creatures of his somewhat fantastical imagination, till they assume a semblance of reality; and with these intelligent phantoms he can conduct, under a playful form, discussions which range far into the deepest problems of life, of society, of philosophy, and even of religion. In such company he is never alone, and we do him no injustice in supposing that some of the pleasantest hours of a successful

life have been spent in it. Like another great writer of our generation, who was visited and consoled in the hour of defeat, not by the Queen of Gain, the Queen of Power, or the Queen of Pleasure, though these wayward sprites had not always neglected him, but by One, 'the last, the mightiest, and the 'best,' the author of 'Lothair' might listen to her voice :—

' Yes, darling, let them go ; so ran the strain,
Yes ; let them go, gain, fashion, pleasure, power :
And all the busy elves to whose domain
Belongs the nether sphere, the fleeting hour.

' Without one envious sigh, one anxious scheme,
The nether sphere, the fleeting hour resign ;
Mine is the world of thought, the world of dream,
Mine all the past, and all the future mine.

' Fortune that lays in sport the mighty low,
Age that to penance turns the joys of youth,,
Shall leave untouched the gifts which I bestow,
The sense of beauty and the thirst of truth.'

That man is undoubtedly born under the happiest star who most effectually combines the energy of active life with the inexhaustible repose of contemplation. Lord Beaconsfield has lived a life of successful contention ; he has wielded the highest power in the State ; he has won all the honours that the favour of his sovereign could confer ; even his political adversaries feel a pride in the career of so remarkable a man. But beyond these gifts of fortune he doubtless values the habit of thought and observation, which he bears with him alike in society and in retirement, and the power of giving to his thoughts a literary coinage, which passes current in all the languages and all the civilised communities of the world. We remember to have heard him say, in one of his felicitous after-dinner speeches, that the reason the Hebrews and the Greeks were by far the most powerful races in history is, that they had a literature. The same remark might apply to statesmen : no oratory, no diplomacy, no legislative ingenuity, confers so great and lasting an influence on a ruler of men as that which he derives from a combination of literary excellence with political power.

Although Lord Beaconsfield will be known in political history as a man of action, who has played no inconsiderable part in the events of the last half-century, we think the contemplative element predominates in his character. He is not a man of impulse, but of slow self-contained thought, often eccentric, sometimes paradoxical—indeed, his public life con-

sists of paradoxes in action—but he is almost always governed and guided by deliberation. In his later years, and in the fulness of power, it is not difficult to trace the working of ideas which germinated years before in his mind; and one of the best guides to these remarkable trains of thought is to be found in his writings, although they are of a light and imaginative description. Lord Beaconsfield has long since disclaimed ‘Vivian Grey’ as a puerile production which he would willingly suppress if it were possible. But ‘Vivian Grey,’ published fifty-four years ago, is the dream of a boy projecting a life; ‘Endymion’ is the retrospect of a veteran who has completed it. ‘Coningsby,’ ‘Sybil,’ and ‘Tancred’ form, he himself tells us, a real trilogy, treating of the same subject, and endeavouring to complete that treatment; the origin and character of political parties, their influence on the people of this country, some pictures of the moral and physical condition of that people, and some intimation of the means by which it might be elevated and improved, were the objects of the author, for they had long engaged his meditation.

In ‘Lothair,’ which we regard as the best and most thoughtful of his works, the characters impersonate the most powerful influences which he conceives to be operating slow but irresistible changes in the society of England and of Europe. Cardinal Grandison represents the dignity and gravity of the Church of Rome; Monsignor Catesby its tricks and artifices; Theodora the higher aspirations of democracy and nationality; whilst the lower passions of the revolutionary sect burst forth in the mad efforts of secret societies, instigated by Mazzini and Mary Anne. The leaders of English society are drawn in glowing colours, surcharged with luxury and wealth, but not unmindful of the claims of public duty; whilst the humbler characters in the piece are types of vulgar middle-class life. None of these personages, to say the truth, have any claim to reality, though many of them are drawn from life, and may be partially recognised. But they are idealised. They are seen through a magical glass. The ingenuous Lothair may well wander in perplexity through so puzzling a world. Over well-known persons and familiar scenes Lord Beaconsfield casts a glow of Oriental magnificence. All his duchesses are beautiful and benign; all his dukes are tall, silent, and exquisitely dressed. His heroes are as rich as Aladdin when he left the Cave of the Lamp; his heroines have inexpressible voices, wit, and grace, with violet eyes and chestnut hair. It is an Arabian Night’s Entertainment transplanted to St. James’s. But beneath all this somewhat tawdry

ornament, and a *mise-en-scène* which resembles a ballet or a pantomime, there runs a vein of thought, sometimes exhaling itself in a blaze of rhetoric, and sometimes sparkling like a gem with satirical brilliancy. Everybody knows the style, everybody is amused by it; no books have been more abused or more read. Suffice it to say that Lord Beaconsfield is the sole inventor of this modern form of the old comedy; that he has no rival in the art; and, so far as we know, no imitators, for they would be indeed intolerable, and would drag us down to the degraded level of what are called 'society' newspapers.

It is strange that Lord Beaconsfield, who has seen so much of English society, fails to perceive that the unostentatious simplicity of the best houses and the noblest families in this country is their greatest charm and their petuiliar distinction. The consequence is, that in describing what he represents as high society, he stamps it with a cruel and inappropriate vulgarity. English gentlemen and ladies do not dress up their children, and still less themselves, in the satin and spangles of an acrobat; and the love of display chiefly manifests itself in a class of society for which, we are sure, Lord Beaconsfield would have no indulgence. Finery in dress, fine writing, affectation in manners, tinsel decorations and furniture, and the like, are the cardinal sins against which the good breeding and good taste of English society continually protest; and even where they exist and are accepted, they are accepted with a contemptuous sneer, not undeserved, except that it is better to eschew such exhibitions altogether. But Lord Beaconsfield and his imaginary society seem to revel in them.

It is a remarkable *tour de force* that an author, whose first novel appeared more than half a century ago, should in the course of a few weeks of retirement have thrown off for his own amusement a tale scarcely less animated and amusing than his productions of earlier years. But the singularity of the case is complete when we learn that this has been the summer occupation of the leader of a great political party, and who ceased but the other day to be the First Minister of the Crown. Everything in Lord Beaconsfield's own life is at least as uncommon as the incidents in his novels; and fortunately there is no rule that excludes literary Ministers of State from returning to practice at or below the Bar, after they have quitted the Bench.

Never was public curiosity more excited. Seven thousand copies of this mysterious novel were sold off before a line of it

had been read by the public, or even by the critics. The publication was an event in the Row. It was said that the noble author was to receive the value of an estate for his copyright. Negotiations were opened with all the leading publishers of Europe and America to secure, as far as possible, the rights of reproduction and translation abroad. If Lord Beaconsfield has any vanity left to be gratified, the reception of 'Endymion' might satiate it.

The probability was that as expectations were raised to an extravagant pitch, they would be disappointed. It is impossible to place 'Endymion' on the same rank, as a work of art and imagination, with 'Lothair.' It is not conceived on so broad a scale; the execution is far slighter and less elaborate. To say the truth, 'Endymion' is a tale without a plot, and with few incidents. In that respect it resembles many of the best novels of the last century, and might be compared to 'Wilhelm Meister' or 'Colonel Jack;' for it aims solely at the evolution and development of one or two characters launched in a political career. Some of the early personal reminiscences of a successful politician and member of society doubtless mingle with these adventures; and if there be any graver purpose in the book, it might be regarded as Lord Beaconsfield's retrospect of the chief political events he has witnessed. We shall not detain our readers by a detailed account of a story which everybody will have read, or will read, before these pages are in their hands; but we propose to dwell a little on some of the more important crises to which it refers.

We agree with Lord Beaconsfield that the death of Mr. Canning in August 1827 was an epoch in English politics. Had Canning lived, it is possible that he might have smoothed the transition from Toryism to a more liberal system of government; the alliance he had succeeded in forming with the Whigs was full of promise for the future. But this hope was extinguished in three months by his death, at that celebrated villa of Chiswick, which had witnessed, twenty-one years before, the last hours of Mr. Fox. Oddly enough, Lord Beaconsfield calls the exquisite classical creation of Lord Burlington a 'Cottage:' there, however, his tale may be said to open. At that point the division between Liberal and Tory politics begins. Mr. Ferrars, the father of the young Endymion, has to make his choice. Rashly, wrongly, and contrary to the sage advice of his friend, Mr. Sidney Wilton (who, in spite of his name, has nothing in common with Mr. Sidney Herbert), he elects to cast in his lot with the Duke of Wellington, who was summoned to form an administration on the

failure of Lord Goderich's ephemeral attempt to carry on the mixed Government.

The Duke of Wellington's Administration by no means excited the degree of confidence among the Tories which Lord Beaconsfield now ascribes to it. The Duke was called upon for the first time to form and conduct a government: he himself had declared a short time before that he would be mad to undertake the task. Lord Lyndhurst, here described as 'the bold Lyndhurst,' never ceased to urge the expediency of an alliance with Lord Grey; Lord Rosslyn, a Whig, was taken into the Cabinet; the country was agitated; Ireland was on the brink of civil war; Mr. Huskisson and the more Liberal members of the Cabinet resigned in four months; and in 1829 the Clare election threw out Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald and returned O'Connell; the Duke declared for Catholic Emancipation, and broke up the Tory party for ever. Such was the whirlpool into which Mr. Ferrars cast his lot, and which Lord Beaconsfield with some complacency describes, at least if we are to accept the enthusiastic vaticinations of Zenobia.

Who that remembers anything of London society fifty, or even thirty, years ago, can fail to recognise in Zenobia the great lady who held her *salon* in Berkeley Square? The sketch Lord Beaconsfield has given of Lady Jersey is true to the life in outward particulars. That of her husband is terse and complete.

'Zenobia did dine with the William Ferrars to-day, and her handsome husband came with her, a knight of the garter and just appointed to a high office in the household by the new government. Even the excitement of the hour did not disturb his indigenous repose. It was a dignified serenity, quite natural, and quite compatible with easy and even cordial manners, and an address always considerate even when not sympathetic. He was not a loud or a long talker, but his terse remarks were full of taste and a just appreciation of things.' (Vol. i. p. 27.)

Into the mouth of this Tory divinity Lord Beaconsfield puts the most extravagant nonsense. She resents the idea of lighting Grosvenor Square with gas. She abhors railroads. She would have gone to St. James's in a sedan chair. Public opinion was to her a myth, and the Whigs are people who would have installed a French prefect at Holland House and made us the slaves of Bonaparte. It is true that when Mr. Charles Greville published in 1843 his volume, advocating the payment of the Catholic clergy in Ireland, Zenobia declared to Sylvanus, her captain of the Guards, that it was 'a wicked book.' 'God forbid she should read it.' But this trait

(though historical) is not in 'Endymion.' Will the author of 'Endymion' be surprised to be told that down to 1828 Zenobia was herself a Whig, and had long upheld the party she is made to decry? We have certainly no reason to complain of the treatment of our own political friends by Lord Beaconsfield. Whenever he has anything particularly absurd to say, he puts it into the mouth of some uncompromising Tory: whenever he makes a just remark on the events of the time or the prospects of the future, it savours of Whiggism. Mr. Ferrars, poor man, comes to ruin and a bad end, because he believed too long and trusted too much to Tory success and Tory gratitude. He is as melancholy an example of a misdirected career as Hogarth's bad apprentice. See what comes of Tory principles! But his son, the hero of the book, and the hope of his father, is essentially a Whig, backed by Liberal influence and Liberal great ladies, and hardly wasting a glance of regret at the traditions of his family. The contrast between the two opinions as they existed in 1828 is cleverly expressed in the following conversation between Mr. Ferrars and Mr. Sidney Wilton, who was a Canningite.

"I see no reason why there should be any great change; certainly not in this country," said Mr. Ferrars. "Here we have changed everything that was required. Peel has settled the criminal law, and Huskisson the currency, and though I am prepared myself still further to reduce the duties on foreign imports, no one can deny that on this subject the Government is in advance of public opinion."

"The whole affair rests on too contracted a basis," said his companion. "We are habituated to its exclusiveness, and, no doubt, custom in England is a power; but let some event suddenly occur which makes a nation feel or think, and the whole thing might vanish like a dream."

"What can happen? Such affairs as the Luddites do not occur twice in a century, and as for Spaffelds riots, they are impossible now with Peel's new police. The country is employed and prosperous, and were it not so, the landed interest would always keep things straight."

"It is powerful, and has been powerful for a long time; but there are other interests besides the landed interest now."

"Well, there is the colonial interest, and the shipping interest," said Mr. Ferrars, "and both of them thoroughly with us."

"I was not thinking of them," said his companion. "It is the increase of population, and of a population not employed in the cultivation of the soil, and all the consequences of such circumstances, that were passing over my mind."

"Don't you be too doctrinaire, my dear Sidney; you and I are practical men. We must deal with the existing, the urgent; and there is nothing more pressing at this moment than the formation of a new government. What I want is to see you a member of it."

“ Ah ! ” said his companion with a sigh, “ do you really think it so near as that ? ”

“ Why, what have we been talking of all this time, my dear Sidney ? Clear your head of all doubt, and, if possible, of all regrets ; we must deal with facts, and we must deal with them to-morrow.”

“ I still think he had a mission,” said Sidney with a sigh, “ if it were only to bring hope to a people.”

“ Well, I do not see he could have done anything more,” said Mr. Ferrars, “ nor do I believe his government would have lasted during the session. However, I must now say good night, for I must look in at the Square. Think well of what I have said, and let me hear from you as soon as you can.” (Vol. i. pp. 6-8.)

The subject of this tale is, as we have already hinted, the evolution of a youthful adventurer in the field of politics, until he emerges, step by step, into what Lord Beaconsfield would call the Emyrean of high office. But one of the oddest things in the book is that *Endymion* himself has very few of the qualifications necessary to attain that great result. He is painstaking and accurate ; but so is many a clerk in Somerset House, who ends his days there. He attends a debating club, but seems more inclined to listen than to make speeches. His character is ‘gentle and docile:’ he easily desponds ; he weakly falls in love and loses his first mistress ; we look in vain in him for high and daring ambition, or that unalterable fixity of purpose which, as Lord Beaconsfield not unreasonably declares, seldom fails to accomplish its purpose. It is faith that moves mountains. When young Mr. Disraeli told Lord Melbourne in Mrs. Norton’s drawing-room that he meant to be Prime Minister of England, faith and determination spoke in him, and spoke not in vain. But we must not seek for any such faith and resolution in *Endymion*. Left to himself he would not, apparently, have risen one step in the social ladder. His manners are pleasing, his principles good ; but he is too soft to work his way in the world. He owes his fortune to the singular accident that he is a young man propelled by his sister. It is Myra, who has the hatred of poverty, the disdain of lowliness, the lofty resolution to succeed, the absolute confidence in her own destiny and in that of her brother, which bear down all obstacles and finally triumph. If *Endymion* is the shepherd lad, she is the divinity who haunts his slumbers, and drives forward with an irresistible power his languid nature.

When Mr. Nigel Penruddock, a young Tractarian clergyman, who begins with the muscular energy of Charles Kingsley and ends with the abstemious fervour of Cardinal Manning, is for a moment diverted from his spiritual career by an incon-

venient passion for Miss Ferrars, which he declares to her in the glades of Hurstley, that intrepid maiden puts him down with authority, and thus declares the purpose of her life :—

“ Let me not mislead you, I do not live for my father—I live for another.”

“ For another ? ” inquired Nigel, with anxiety.

“ For one you know. My life is devoted to Endymion. There is a mystic bond between us, originating, perhaps, in the circumstance of our birth ; for we are twins. I never mean to embarrass him with a sister’s love, and perhaps hereafter may see less of him even than I see now ; but I shall be in the world, whatever be my lot, high or low—the active, stirring world—working for him, thinking alone of him. Yes ; moulding events and circumstances in his favour ; ” and she spoke with fiery animation. “ I have brought myself, by long meditation, to the conviction that a human being with a settled purpose must accomplish it, and that nothing can resist a will that will stake even existence for its fulfilment.” (Vol. i. pp. 244, 245.)

Myra is in reality the inspiring genius of the fable. She reads at a glance the high destinies of Prince Florestan, with whom her own life is at last so strangely united ; and she alone supplies the resources and the energy which raise her brother in the world. In the mystical verses which conclude the second part of ‘ Faust,’ the great German poet hears the voices of angels singing that

‘ Das Ewig-Weibliche
Zieht uns hinan ; ’

which, freely translated, means the Feminine Principle of Life drives us through the spheres. This seems to be the belief of the author of ‘ Endymion.’ The Feminine principle is the spring, not only of society, but of politics. He deals with it as it exists in the drawing-rooms of Mayfair, but its influence extends to all the purposes of life. We shall not stop to discuss at length this ingenious paradox, but we must be permitted to say that it puts a false and cynical construction on English public life. The influence of women in society smoothes many difficulties, encourages many efforts, sometimes aids in counsel by penetration and sympathy. But the task of ruling empires, and even of rising in the world, demands sterner virtues ; and it is a degrading conception of a great mission in life to represent it as the plaything of fanciful attachments and feminine intrigue. Having entered our humble protest against this doctrine of our author, we will quote another passage on the secret of success in life, with which we are more disposed to agree :—

“As a general rule, the most successful man in life is the man who has the best information.”

“But what a rare thing is success in life!” said Endymion. “I often wonder whether I shall ever be able to step out of the crowd.”

“You may have success in life without stepping out of the crowd,” said the baron.

“A sort of success,” said Endymion; “I know what you mean. But what I mean is real success in life. I mean, I should like to be a public man.”

“Why?” asked the baron.

“Well, I should like to have power,” said Endymion, blushing.

“The most powerful men are not public men,” said the baron. “A public man is responsible, and a responsible man is a slave. It is private life that governs the world. You will find this out some day. The world talks much of powerful sovereigns and great ministers; and if being talked about made one powerful, they would be irresistible. But the fact is, the more you are talked about the less powerful you are.”

“But surely King Luitbrand is a powerful monarch; they say he is the wisest of men. And the Emperor Harold, who has succeeded in everything. And as for ministers, who is a great man if it be not Prince Wenceslaus?”

“King Luitbrand is governed by his doctor, who is capable of governing Europe, but has no ambition that way; the Emperor Harold is directed by his mistress, who is a woman of a certain age with a vast sagacity, but who also believes in sorcery; and as for Prince Wenceslaus, he is inspired by an individual as obscure as ourselves, and who, for aught I know, may be, at this moment, like ourselves, drinking a cup of coffee in a hired lodging.”

“What you say about public life amazes me,” said Endymion musingly.

“Think over it,” said the baron. “As an Englishman, you will have difficulty in avoiding public life. But at any rate do not at present be discontented that you are unknown. It is the first condition of real power. When you have succeeded in life according to your views, and I am inclined to believe you will so succeed, you will, some day, sigh for real power, and denounce the time when you became a public man, and belonged to anyone but yourself. But our friend calls me. He has found something startling. I will venture to say, if there be anything in it, it has been brought about by some individual of whom you never heard.” (Vol. i. pp. 329-331.)

The world is perhaps most largely influenced and great events brought about by men and causes which have nothing in common with the rhetoric of speeches or the posture-making of public performers.

A writer of fiction who aims at laying bare the springs of public life and the secrets of political success, might be supposed to take a generous and lofty view of the statesman's profession.

But, to our surprise, the author of 'Endymion' has not thought it necessary to endow his hero with one patriotic sentiment, or to make him capable of any great action. Politics, as here described, are the pursuit of power for the most vulgar and selfish motives; they begin and end with the desire of personal profit and social distinction. Even Myra, ambitious as she is for her brother, is ambitious mainly for the reintegration of her fallen family, the recovery of lost luxuries, and the advantages of personal preferment. We must again protest against this cynical doctrine. Success in politics in this country is not to be obtained by the intrigues of great ladies in Mayfair, or the favour of maids who visit the glimpses of the moon. It is the reward of toil, of knowledge, of eloquence, of daring in a great cause. These are manly duties, these are noble arts; and we should be sorry to suppose that Lord Beaconsfield holds that political success can be achieved without them. But he has not thought fit to arm Endymion with these weapons. The lad begins well, because his father begs for him a clerkship in a public office; but if he ends in being anything more than an under-secretary, it is because he has married a dowager. It is true, we are told, that the Under-secretaries of State, whose chiefs have been in the House of Lords, are a very illustrious set of men, and ought to have a gallery of portraits to themselves.

It is time, however, that we return to the fortunes of the Ferrars family. The ruin and death of Endymion's father, caused by his fatal preference for the Tory cause, which had left him no resources but those afforded him by the 'Quarterly Review'—a journal then in its prime, and which always paid its contributors—reduced his orphan children to a very low condition.

'Merses profundo, pulchrior evenit'

might be Endymion's motto. As for himself, he is obliged to accept a garret in the lodging-house of his father's valet, who had married his mother's maid or dressmaker; and he owes his coat to the generosity of a tailor who opens to him an unlimited credit for dress at a well-known establishment in Savile Row. He dines at 'Joe's' with his brother clerks, eats mutton, and drinks half-and-half. As for his sister, she answers the advertisement of a young lady in search of a companion, and a single touch of the magician's wand at once places her in a family and a mansion rivalling the splendour of Gunnersbury and Mentmore. These situations are convenient. Anybody may be brought into a lodging-house; and

the hospitable table of the Neuchatels might embrace the adventurers of two hemispheres.

Nevertheless, our Endymion is living on the verge of Bohemia. Mr. Rodney, the ex-valet, is his best friend; Mr. Vigo, his philanthropic tailor (whom we all remember very well, though it is more by the grandeur of his bills and his equipage than by his hock and cigars that he dwells in our own memory), had a turn for speculation on the turf and in the ring. By the law of evolution these persons become from small beginnings millionnaires and potentates. Their female connexions subdue mankind by exquisite dresses and a free-and-easy style of living, which ends of course by raising them to the highest ranks of the British aristocracy. Such a scene as the trip to the Derby on the young earl's drag seems ridiculous; yet we remember to have heard a late Minister Plenipotentiary describe an excursion to Richmond with a future empress on the dickey of the carriage; this certainly resembles it.

It deserves to be remarked, especially as this work is to be the guide of ambitious youth and future statesmen, that next to the influence of great ladies, the author of '*Endymion*' lays the greatest stress on *dress*. To quote the words of the greatest conceivable authority on this subject:—

"Dress does not make a man, but it often makes a successful one. The most precious stone, you know, must be cut and polished. I shall enter your name in my books for an unlimited credit, and no account to be settled till you are a privy councillor. I do not limit the credit, because you are a man of sense and a gentleman, and will not abuse it. But be quite as careful not to stint yourself as not to be needlessly extravagant. In the first instance, you would be interfering with my experiment, and that would not be fair."

This conversation took place in Mr. Vigo's counting-house the morning after the entertainment at his villa. Endymion called upon Mr. Vigo in his way to his office, as he had been requested to do, and Mr. Vigo had expressed his wishes and intentions with regard to Endymion as intimated in the preceding remarks.

"I have known many an heiress lost by her suitor being ill-dressed," said Mr. Vigo. "You must dress according to your age, your pursuits, your object in life; you must dress too, in some cases, according to your set. In youth a little fancy is rather expected, but if political life be your object, it should be avoided, at least after one-and-twenty. I am dressing two brothers now, men of considerable position; one is a mere man of pleasure, the other will probably be a minister of state. They are as like as two peas, but were I to dress the dandy and the minister the same, it would be bad taste—it would be ridiculous. No man gives me the trouble which Lord Eglantine does; he has not made up his mind whether he will be a great poet or prime minister. 'You must choose, my lord,' I tell him. 'I cannot

send you out looking like Lord Byron if you mean to be a Canning or a Pitt.' I have dressed a great many of our statesmen and orators, and I always dressed them according to their style and the nature of their duties. What all men should avoid is the 'shabby genteel.' No man ever gets over it. I will save you from that. You had better be in rags." (Vol. i. pp. 213, 214.)

On these grounds Endymion condescends to be dressed by his tailor gratis. We should have respected him more if he had worn an old coat. The incident, however, is not likely, as far as our experience goes, to be of frequent occurrence. Youths are seldom exposed to the temptation of sartorial munificence, or if they are, it is at 30 per cent. interest on the transaction.

Stripped of the artifices of the novelist, one fancies that occurrences like those which the author of 'Endymion' loves to describe are improbable or impossible. But in fairness let us acknowledge that we have seen things quite as extraordinary happen on every side of us. How many American adventuresses have snapped up some of the prettiest heirs apparent in England! How many foreign or domestic *chevaliers d'industrie* have penetrated into London drawing-rooms, and even basked in the indiscriminating smiles of royal favour! How long is it since railway kings of humbler origin and education than Mr. Rodney have been enthroned for a transitory reign? Has not London seen the Sylvias and the Imogenes of the day emerging from the green room, or some less known place, to play the part of leaders of fashion? and have not these ladies so completely entered into that part, that all recollection of their humbler origin has vanished from their own memory, and is only preserved by the envy or churlishness of their rivals? Has not an Emperor married and placed on the throne a young lady of good birth and distinguished attractions, but born in narrow circumstances and educated at an English boarding school? Has not a young gentleman of literary parentage, starting from a point considerably lower than that of Endymion Ferrars, with no grandfather and father in the Privy Council, and no countesses or duchesses to smile upon his early, and sometimes bizarre, advances to greatness—has not such an English politician realised and surpassed the visions of his own imagination? Lord Montfort is introduced in these volumes reading with amusement the novel of 'Topsy-Turvy:' that is exactly the sensation produced in our own minds by this work. Everything is 'topsy-turvy,' and it would be folly to expect the world to go straight. The pompous old idols of the past are broken. The Goddess of

Reason is in the streets. Mankind have discovered the true law of human descent from an amœba or a bacterion; and society itself is now undergoing a process of evolution which will ere long transmute everything we have seen for the last half-century into new forms of being. The author of 'Endymion' seems to take a pleasure in accelerating the process. 'Topsy-Turvy' is not a work of conservative tendencies.

Poor Endymion seems a good deal puzzled by the light of the Bohemian society in which he lived at Warwick Street, though even then a Pretender inhabited the second floor, and now and then a young earl dropped in to five o'clock tea; who, indeed, ultimately raised Miss Imogene to her proud position of Countess of Beaumaris, which she filled with so much dignity. But whilst Endymion was still struggling with the ledgers at Somerset House, his sister Myra had struck root in a far more congenial soil. Entering a great house as the companion of an amiable and unpretending young lady, the talents and spirit of Myra make her the most conspicuous person in it. There she is launched on the broad stream of society. The Pretender reappears, whom we knew as a boy under the name of a son of the Queen of Mesopotamia, which is Lord Beaconsfield's mode of spelling 'Holland.' Myra, of course, divines his true character. Some of the details of what the future Emperor of the French was in those days are hit off to the life; we have ourselves seen such passages: the incident of the American conjuring tricks (which Lord Roehampton naturally describes as 'characteristic') took place one evening at Gore House, and, if we are not mistaken, in the presence of Mr. Disraeli. Indeed the whole sketch of the character of 'Prince Florestan,' as he was forty years ago in England—dreamy, sometimes fatuous, but inspired by what he called 'destiny'—is extremely felicitous and correct, though at that time the consummation of his brilliant but fleeting triumph was still far off. Meanwhile Myra draws her brother by attraction into this famous circle. The hospitable Baron gives him a knife and fork at Hainault Park whenever he pleases. Adriana, the great heiress, falls insensibly in love with him: but, what is far more important, Lord Roehampton, the accomplished statesman, man of the world, and Minister, proposes to Myra herself and marries her. As far as this event affected the career of Endymion, the result is obvious. It was another *crutch* in the way of promotion. He has become, by no act of his own, the brother of a woman of fashion, and the brother-in-law of a great Minister. With these aids to greatness he migrates from Somerset House to the Board of Trade, where

he becomes Private Secretary of the President of that office. But all this is what Lord Bacon calls swimming in cork-jackets. We are surprised that Lord Beaconsfield should describe this subordinate life of the public offices, and this borrowed light of fashionable society, as a means of preparation for high political office and parliamentary success. The fact is that it is just the reverse. The Civil Service of this country consists of a number of excellent, upright, and able men: they are the nerves of the administration of the empire; but they begin and end by the extinction of party passions and personal notoriety—the two mainsprings of those who figure on the stage of politics. They are the men of whom it may be said, as in the passage already quoted, ‘if there be anything in it, it has been brought about by some individual of whom you never heard.’ And there are very few instances indeed of men passing from the permanent civil office to a successful parliamentary career. The talent and character required in the two branches of our political system are absolutely distinct, if not incompatible. The following remarks on the relations of a private secretary to his chief are marked by all the *finesse* of truth and experience. No minister ever raised the post of private secretary to such dignity and importance as Lord Beaconsfield has done; and he was rewarded for his confidence by incomparable zeal, fidelity, and affection: but this is not the path to independent statesmanship.

‘The relations between a minister and his secretary are, or at least should be, among the finest that can subsist between two individuals. Except the married state, there is none in which so great a degree of confidence is involved, in which more forbearance ought to be exercised, or more sympathy ought to exist. There is usually in the relation an identity of interest, and that of the highest kind; and the perpetual difficulties, the alternations of triumph and defeat, develop devotion. A youthful secretary will naturally feel some degree of enthusiasm for his chief, and a wise minister will never stint his regard for one in whose intelligence and honour he finds he can place confidence.

‘There never was a happier prospect of these relations being established on the most satisfactory basis than in the instance of Endymion and his new master. Mr. Sidney Wilton was a man of noble disposition, fine manners, considerable culture, and was generally gracious. But he was disposed to be more than gracious to Endymion, and when he found that our young friend had a capacity for work—that his perception was quick and clear—that he wrote with facility—never made difficulties—was calm, sedulous, and patient, the interest which Mr. Wilton took in him as the son of William Ferrars, and, we must add, as the brother of Lady Roehampton, became absorbed in the personal regard which the minister soon entertained for his secretary.

Mr. Wilton found a pleasure in forming the mind of Endymion to the consideration and comprehension of public affairs; he spoke to him both of men and things without reserve; revealed to him the characters of leading personages on both sides, illustrated their antecedents, and threw light upon their future; taught him the real condition of parties in Parliament, rarely to be found in newspapers; and finally, when he was sufficiently initiated, obtained for his secretary a key for his cabinet boxes, which left little of the business of government unknown to Endymion.

‘Such great confidence, and that exhibited by one who possessed so many winning qualities, excited in the breast of Endymion the most lively feelings of gratitude and regard. He tried to prove them by the vigilant and unwearying labour with which he served his master, and he served him every day more effectually, because every day he became more intimate with the mind and method of Mr. Wilton. Everyone to a certain degree is a mannerist; everyone has his ways; and a secretary will be assisted in the transaction of business if a vigilant observation has made him acquainted with the idiosyncrasy of his chief.’ (Vol. ii. pp. 134–137.)

Lord Beaconsfield’s personal sketches of his contemporaries are like the late H. B.’s charming caricatures of the same individuals: they suggest a striking resemblance, without vulgarity or exaggeration, although almost all the surrounding circumstances are changed and dissimilar. Thus H. B. could draw Lord Brougham as the man of fifty nationalities, without deviating from his personal identity. The author of ‘Endymion’ has done the same by Lord Roehampton. The circumstances of his life, his marriage, and his interior are fictitious and bear no resemblance to fact: but the personal identity of the man is so clearly marked that it is impossible to mistake it, and it is one of the best passages in the book.

‘The Earl of Roehampton was the strongest member of the Government, except, of course, the Premier himself. He was the man from whose combined force and flexibility of character the country had confidence that in all their councils there would be no lack of courage, yet tempered with adroit discretion. Lord Roehampton, though an Englishman, was an Irish peer, and was resolved to remain so, for he fully appreciated the position, which united social distinction with the power of a seat in the House of Commons. He was a very ambitious, and, as it was thought, worldly man, deemed even by many to be unscrupulous, and yet he was romantic. A great favourite in society, and especially with the softer sex, somewhat late in life, he had married suddenly a beautiful woman, who was without fortune, and not a member of the enchanted circle in which he flourished. The union had been successful, for Lord Roehampton was gifted with a sweet temper, and, though people said he had no heart, with a winning tenderness of disposition or at least of manner which at the same time charmed and soothed. He had been a widower for two years, and the

world was of opinion that he ought to marry again, and form this time a becoming alliance. In addition to his many recommendations he had now the inestimable reputation, which no one had ever contemplated for him, of having been a good husband.' (Vol. ii. pp. 26, 27.)

Not all, or even many, of the characters in this tale are so clearly defined from real life, and they all belong, we think, to the last generation: we detect no living portraits or allusions. Most of them are rather of the composite order. For instance, Berengaria, Countess of Montfort, is to the Whig party what Zenobia is to the Tories: but, like Raphael's Madonnas, this perfection of Whig supremacy is compounded, apparently, from numerous fragments into one ideal. And, after all, Lady Montfort's chief affairs in life seem to be to amuse an unamusable husband (with whom she does not live much); to assist in the traffic of seats; to marry her friends; to make a pleasant house for her party; and finally to wed the hero of this tale, who must have been greatly younger than herself, and was once her *protégé*. But in this Lady Montfort only anticipated the latest whim of a degenerate age. Topsy-turvy again. Mr. Waldershare bears a more exact resemblance to the features of the late Mr. George Smyth, finely delineated. Lord Montfort reminds us of the late Lord Hertford, for 'he was totally devoid of the sense of responsibility, and he looked what he resembled'—that is, an English nobleman of the eighteenth century. That is a sinister compliment, especially when it is followed by a character not unlike a page of La Bruyère.

'With the exception of the memorable year when he sacrificed his nomination boroughs to the cause for which Hampden died on the field and Sidney on the scaffold—that is to say, the Whig government of England—Lord Montfort had been absent from his country for ten years, and one day, in his statued garden at the Belvedere, he asked himself what he had gained by it. There was no subject, divine or human, in which he took the slightest interest. He entertained for human nature generally, and without any exception, the most cynical appreciation. He had a sincere and profound conviction, that no man or woman ever acted except from selfish and interested motives. Society was intolerable to him; that of his own sex and station wearisome beyond expression; their conversation consisted only of two subjects, horses and women, and he had long exhausted both. As for female society, if they were ladies, it was expected that, in some form or other, he should make love to them, and he had no sentiment. If he took refuge in the *demi-monde*, he encountered vulgarity, and that, to Lord Montfort, was insufferable. He had tried them in every capital, and vulgarity was the badge of all their tribe. He had attempted to read; a woman had told him to read French novels, but he found them only a clumsy representation of the life which, for years,

he had practically been leading. An accident made him acquainted with Rabelais and Montaigne; and he had relished them, for he had a fine sense of humour. He might have pursued these studies, and perhaps have found in them a slight and occasional distraction, but a clever man he met at a guingette at Passy, whither he had gone to try to dissipate his weariness in disguise, had convinced him, that if there were a worthy human pursuit, an assumption which was doubtful, it was that of science, as it impressed upon man his utter insignificance.

'No one could say Lord Montfort was a bad-hearted man, for he had no heart. He was good-natured, provided it brought him no inconvenience; and as for temper, his was never disturbed, but this not from sweetness of disposition, rather from a contemptuous fine taste, which assured him, that a gentleman should never be deprived of tranquillity in a world where nothing was of the slightest consequence.

'The result of these reflections was, that he was utterly wearied with Belvedere and Paris, and as his mind was now rather upon science, he fancied he should like to return to a country where it flourished, and where he indulged in plans of erecting colossal telescopes, and of promoting inquiry into the origin of things. He thought that with science and with fishing, the only sport to which he still really clung, for he liked the lulling influence of running streams, and a pastime he could pursue in loneliness, existence might perhaps be endured.' (Vol. ii. pp. 158-161.)

It was certainly fortunate that so unattractive a personage found a Lady Berengaria to take care of him, and Lady Montfort was equal to the occasion, by daily correspondence, and by procuring for her misanthropical lord a perennial supply of civil engineers—to whom, in due time, Endymion was added as a frequent guest.

No bolder feat could be attempted even by a Whig Queen of Society than to hold a tournament in a northern castle under such unpromising auspices, especially as at that very moment the Whig Ministry was defeated in the House of Commons, and only recovered its position by the determination of Berengaria, Countess of Montfort, to cling stoutly to her place in the household. She was the 'Duchesse de Longueville at the ear of our young Queen'—an impossible situation: so the author of 'Endymion' concludes that 'the Conservative Leaders, *as is now generally admitted*, were decidedly in error, 'and the Whigs returned to office.' We should rather be disposed to say that this Bedchamber Plot was no plot at all, but a misunderstanding in which there were faults on both sides. This event did not, however, interfere with the tournament, and although such an incident might appear rather far-fetched in a modern novel of society, yet those whose memories

extend to 1839 may have witnessed the scene; and although the good knights are many of them dust, and their good swords rust, the Queen of Beauty of that day is still, we are happy to say, living amongst us.

From these pageants, which only cost Endymion a heart-ache, he is rapidly transferred to a more practical scene. It strikes his chief, Mr. Wilton, that it would be well to know something more of the Anti-Corn-Law League, and accordingly his secretary is sent down into Lancashire to observe with tact and be silent. 'Perseverance and tact,' says our author, 'are the two qualities most valuable for all men who would mount, but especially for those who have to step out of the crowd.' He evidently places them far above what is commonly called genius—and not unwisely.

Arrived in Manchester, Endymion attends a meeting of operatives or 'hands,' where his attention is speedily awakened by the address of one of the then but little known leaders of the movement.

'Endymion listened with interest, soon with delight, soon with a feeling of exciting and not unpleasing perplexity, to the orator; for he was an orator, though then unrecognised, and known only in his district. He was a pale and slender man, with a fine brow and an eye that occasionally flashed with the fire of a creative mind. His voice certainly was not like Hollaballoo's. It was rather thin, but singularly clear. There was nothing clearer except his meaning. Endymion never heard a case stated with such pellucid art; facts marshalled with such vivid simplicity, and inferences so natural and spontaneous and irresistible, that they seemed, as it were, borrowed from his audience, though none of that audience had arrived at them before. The meeting was hushed, was rapt in intellectual delight, for they did not give the speaker the enthusiasm of their sympathy. That was not shared, perhaps, by the moiety of those who listened to him. When his case was fairly before them, the speaker dealt with his opponents—some in the press, some in Parliament—with much power of sarcasm, but this power was evidently rather repressed than allowed to run riot. What impressed Endymion as the chief quality of this remarkable speaker was his persuasiveness, and he had the air of being too prudent to offend even an opponent unnecessarily. His language, though natural and easy, was choice and refined. He was evidently a man who had read, and not a little; and there was no taint of vulgarity, scarcely a provincialism, in his pronunciation.

'He spoke for rather more than an hour; and frequently during this time, Endymion, notwithstanding his keen interest in what was taking place, was troubled, it might be disturbed, by pictures and memories of the past that he endeavoured in vain to drive away. When the orator concluded, amid cheering much louder than that which had first greeted him, Endymion, in a rather agitated voice, whispered to his neighbour, "Tell me—is his name Thornberry?"

“That is your time of day,” said the operative. “Job Thornberry is his name, and I am on his works.” (Vol. ii. pp. 261–263.)

This Job Thornberry was an old acquaintance of the Ferrars’, son of the farmer at their retreat in Berkshire; a man of true rustic origin, but who rose by an alliance with Lancashire interests and ideas to the rank of a statesman. The old friends soon met. Perhaps of all the reminiscences in this book none is so lifelike and free from exaggeration as this portrait of Richard Cobden, for he is obviously the subject of it:—

“You are not much altered,” said Thornberry, as he retained Endymion’s hand, and he looked at him earnestly; “and yet you have become a man. I suppose I am ten years your senior. I have never been back to the old place, and yet I sometimes think I should like to be buried there. The old man has been here, and more than once, and liked it well enough; at least, I hope so. He told me a good deal about you all; some sorrows, and, I hope, some joys. I heard of Miss Myra’s marriage; she was a sweet young lady; the gravest person I ever knew; I never knew her smile. I remember they thought her proud, but I always had a fancy for her. Well; she has married a topsawyer—I believe the ablest of them all, and probably the most unprincipled; though I ought not to say that to you. However, public men are spoken freely of. I wish to heaven you would get him to leave off tinkering those commercial treaties that he is always making such a fuss about. More pernicious nonsense was never devised by man than treaties of commerce. However, their precious most favoured nation clause will break down the whole concern yet. But you wish to see the works; I will show them to you myself. There is not much going on now, and the stagnation increases daily. And then, if you are willing, we will go home and have a bit of lunch—I live hard by. My best works are my wife and children: I have made that joke before, as you can well fancy.”

‘This was the greeting, sincere but not unkind, of Job Thornberry to Endymion on the day after the meeting of the Anti-Corn-Law League. To Endymion it was an interesting, and, as he believed it would prove, a useful encounter.’ (Vol. ii. pp. 265, 266.)

In the conversation which ensues between them Job Thornberry explains to the wondering Endymion his theory of free trade, breaking down the barriers of the world, and at home co-operation. It is rather amusing to recollect that this stern enemy of commercial treaties was the man who conducted the negotiations with France in 1860, and actually signed the most important and useful commercial treaty of this century. Cobden, like all the leaders of the Manchester school, was a man of narrow intellect and of small acquaintance with mankind or with history, but of generous impulses, of sanguine hopes, of indefatigable energy. Nothing would astonish him

more than to know that forty years after his great triumph in Britain, all foreign nations remain absolutely unconverted by the doctrine he preached to mankind, and that the United States of America, the land of his own predilection, is the most determined opponent of free trade. Queen Berengaria, however, took small account of these signs of the times. She held that ministers would consent to no nonsense about the Corn Laws; that the royal marriage would occupy the world; that, after all, a majority of *one* is enough; and that, although trade and the revenue were declining, they never ruined a country or upset a government. This means that the Queen of the Whigs was as blind to the future in 1840 as the Queen of the Tories had been in 1828. For even the success of Lord Palmerston's adventurous policy in the East, which brought us to the verge of war with France, could not save the Administration.

‘But, as Mr. Tadpole observed, with much originality, at the Carlton, they were dancing on a volcano. It was December, and the harvest was not yet all got in, the spring corn had never grown, and the wheat was rusty; there was, he well knew, another deficiency in the revenue, to be counted by millions; wise men shook their heads and said the trade was leaving the country, and it was rumoured that the whole population of Paisley lived on the rates.

“Lord Roehampton thinks that something must be done about the corn laws,” murmured Berengaria one day to Endymion, rather crest-fallen; “but they will try sugar and timber first. I think it all nonsense, but nonsense is sometimes necessary.”

‘This was the first warning of that famous budget of 1841 which led to such vast consequences, and which, directly or indirectly, gave such a new form and colour to English politics. Sidney Wilton and his friends were at length all-powerful in the cabinet because, in reality, there was nobody to oppose them. The vessel was water-logged. The premier shrugged his shoulders; and Lord Roehampton said, “We may as well try it, because the alternative is, we shall have to resign.”

‘Affairs went on badly for the ministry during the early part of the session. They were more than once in a minority, and on Irish questions, which then deeply interested the country; but they had resolved that their fate should be decided by their financial measures, and Mr. Sidney Wilton and his friends were still sanguine as to the result. On the last day of April the Chancellor of the Exchequer introduced the budget, and proposed to provide for the deficiency by reducing the protective duties on sugar and timber. A few days after, the leader of the House of Commons himself announced a change in the corn laws, and the intended introduction of grain at various-priced duties per quarter.

‘Then commenced the struggle of a month. Ultimately, Sir Robert Peel himself gave notice of a resolution of want of confidence in the

ministry; and after a week's debate it was carried, in an almost complete house, by a majority of one!' (Vol. ii. pp. 295-297.)

The defeated ministers determined to dissolve on their budget—a resolution which was taken, as is now well known, against the wishes and opinions of the wisest and ablest members of the Cabinet, including Lord Melbourne himself; and the effect of the dissolution on the fate of Endymion was that it enabled his friends to put him into the House of Commons, that is, with the aid of a mysterious gift of 20,000*l.* which came in the nick of time to make him independent of his official salary. With a singular want of that tact he is said to possess, Endymion ascribes to Lady Montfort the gift which obviously proceeded from the enamoured Adriana.

We reach the third volume of our story before the hero of it is landed, after the usual amount of intrigue, in the House of Commons of 1841. To be sure, he is still only two-and-twenty, and has life before him. The picture drawn of the House of Commons of that date by one who played a considerable part in it, is not without interest:—

‘In old days, it was the habit to think and say that the House of Commons was an essentially “queer place,” which no one could understand until he was a member of it. It may, perhaps, be doubted whether that somewhat mysterious quality still altogether attaches to that assembly. “Our own Reporter” has invaded it in all its purlieus. No longer content with giving an account of the speeches of its members, he is not satisfied unless he describes their persons, their dress, and their characteristic mannerisms. He tells us how they dine, even the wines and dishes which they favour, and follows them into the very mysteries of their smoking-room. And yet there is perhaps a certain fine sense of the feelings, and opinions, and humours of this assembly, which cannot be acquired by hasty notions and necessarily superficial remarks, but must be the result of long and patient observation, and of that quick sympathy with human sentiment, in all its classes, which is involved in the possession of that inestimable quality styled tact.

‘When Endymion Ferriars first took his seat in the House of Commons, it still fully possessed its character of enigmatic tradition. It had been thought that this, in a great degree, would have been dissipated by the Reform Act of 1832, which suddenly introduced into the hallowed precinct a number of individuals whose education, manners, modes of thought, were different from those of the previous inhabitants, and in some instances, and in some respects, quite contrary to them. But this was not so. After a short time, it was observed that the old material, though at first much less in quantity, had leavened the new mass; that the tone of the former house was imitated and adopted, and that at the end of five years, about the time Endymion was returned to Parliament, much of its serene, and refined, and even classical character had been recovered.

‘For himself, he entered the chamber with a certain degree of awe, which, with use, diminished, but never entirely disappeared. The scene was one over which his boyhood even had long mused, and it was associated with all those traditions of genius, eloquence, and power that charm and inspire youth. His practical acquaintance with the forms and habits of the House from his customary attendance on their debates as private secretary to a cabinet minister, was of great advantage to him, and restrained that excitement which dangerously accompanies us when we enter into a new life, and especially a life of such deep and thrilling interests and such large proportions. This result was also assisted by his knowledge, at least by sight, of a large proportion of the old members, and by his personal and sometimes intimate acquaintance with those of his own party. There was much in his position, therefore, to soften that awkward feeling of being a freshman, which is always embarrassing.

‘He took his place on the second bench of the opposition side of the house, and nearly behind Lord Rochampton. Mr. Bertie Tremaine, whom Endymion encountered in the lobby as he was escaping to dinner, highly disapproved of this step. He had greeted Endymion with affable condescension. “You made your first mistake to-night, my dear Ferrars. You should have taken your seat below the gangway and near me, on the Mountain. You, like myself, are a man of the future.”

‘Job Thornberry took his seat below the gangway, on the opposition side, and on the floor of the House. Mr. Bertie Tremaine had sent his brother, Mr. Tremaine Bertie, to look after this new star, who he was anxious should ascend the Mountain; but Job Thornberry wishing to know whether the Mountain were going for “total and immediate,” and not obtaining a sufficiently distinct reply, declined the proffered intimation. Mr. Bertie Tremaine, being a landed proprietor as well as leader of the Mountain, was too much devoted to the rights of labour to sanction such middle-class madness.

“Peel will have to do it,” said Job. “You will see.”

‘One of the most interesting members of the House of Commons was Sir Fraunceys Scrope. He was the father of the House, though it was difficult to believe that from his appearance. He was tall, and had kept his distinguished figure; a handsome man, with a musical voice, and a countenance now benignant, though very bright, and once haughty. He still retained the same fashion of costume in which he had ridden up to Westminster more than half a century ago, from his seat in Derbyshire, to support his dear friend Charles Fox; real top-boots, and a blue coat and buff waistcoat. He was a great friend of Lord Rochampton, had a large estate in the same county, and had refused an earldom. Knowing Endymion, he came and sat by him one day in the House, and asked him, good-naturedly, how he liked his new life.

“It is very different from what it was when I was your age. Up to Easter we rarely had a regular debate, never a party division; very few people came up indeed. But there was a good deal of speaking on all subjects before dinner. We had the privilege then of speaking on the presentation of petitions at any length, and we seldom spoke on

any other occasion. After Easter there was always at least one great party fight. This was a mighty affair, talked of for weeks before it came off, and then rarely an adjourned debate. We were gentlemen, used to sit up late, and should have been sitting up somewhere else had we not been in the House of Commons. After this party fight, the House for the rest of the session was a mere club."

"There was not much business doing then," said Endymion.

"There was not much business in the country then. The House of Commons was very much like what the House of Lords is now. You went home to dine, and now and then came back for an important division."

"But you must always have had the estimates here," said Endymion.

"Yes, but they ran through very easily. Hume was the first man who attacked the estimates. What are you going to do with yourself to-day? Will you take your mutton with me? You must come in boots, for it is now dinner-time, and you must return, I fancy. Twenty years ago, no man would think of coming down to the House except in evening dress. I remember so late as Mr. Canning, the minister always came down in silk stockings and pantaloons, or knee breeches. All things change, and quoting Virgil, as that young gentleman has just done, will be the next thing to disappear. In the last parliament we often had Latin quotations, but never from a member with a new constituency. I have heard Greek quoted here, but that was long ago, and a great mistake. The House was quite alarmed. Charles Fox used to say as to quotation—'No Greek; as much Latin as you like; and never French under any circumstances. No English poet unless he had completed his century.' These were like some other good rules, the unwritten orders of the House of Commons." (Vol. iii. pp. 73-81.)

Sir Robert Peel's Government was for a time powerful, but not popular. One reads with curiosity the criticisms addressed to it by a member of the party, who afterwards became the fiercest assailant of its chief; and we perceive with pleasure that the language in which Lord Beaconsfield now speaks of Sir Robert, though cold and somewhat severe, is perfectly courteous. He attributes the commercial depression of 1842 not to a tariff or any system of taxation, but to over-production and an abuse of capital and credit; and the remedy came in an unforeseen form.

"And yet all this time, there were certain influences at work in the great body of the nation, neither foreseen, nor for some time recognised, by statesmen and those great capitalists on whose opinion statesmen much depend, which were stirring, as it were, like the unconscious power of the forces of nature, and which were destined to baffle all the calculations of persons in authority and the leading spirits of all parties, strengthen a perplexed administration, confound a sanguine opposition, render all the rhetoric, statistics, and subscriptions of the Anti-Corn-Law League fruitless, and absolutely make the Chartists forget the Charter.

“My friends will not assist themselves by resisting the government measures,” said Mr. Neuchatel, with his usual calm smile, half sceptical, half sympathetic. “The measures will do no good, but they will do no harm. There are no measures that will do any good at this moment. We do not want measures; what we want is a new channel.”

“That is exactly what was wanted. There was abundant capital in the country and a mass of unemployed labour. But the markets on which they had of late depended, the American especially, were overworked and overstocked, and in some instances were not only overstocked, but disturbed by war, as the Chinese, for example—and capital and labour wanted “a new channel.”

“The new channel came, and all the persons of authority, alike political and commercial, seemed quite surprised that it had arrived; but when a thing or a man is wanted, they generally appear. One or two lines of railway, which had been long sleepily in formation, about this time were finished, and one or two lines of railway, which had been finished for some time and were unnoticed, announced dividends, and not contemptible ones. Suddenly there was a general feeling in the country, that its capital should be invested in railways; that the whole surface of the land should be transformed, and covered, as by a network, with these mighty means of communication. When the passions of the English, naturally an enthusiastic people, are excited on a subject of finance, their will, their determination, and resource, are irresistible. This was signally proved in the present instance, for they never ceased subscribing their capital until the sum entrusted to this new form of investment reached an amount almost equal to the national debt; and this too in a very few years. The immediate effect on the condition of the country was absolutely prodigious. The value of land rose, all the blast furnaces were relit, a stimulant was given to every branch of the home trade, the amount suddenly paid in wages exceeded that ever known in this country, and wages too at a high rate. Large portions of the labouring classes not only enjoyed comfort, but commanded luxury. All this of course soon acted on the revenue, and both customs and especially excise soon furnished an ample surplus.

“It cannot be pretended that all this energy and enterprise were free in their operation from those evils which, it seems, must inevitably attend any extensive public speculation, however well-founded. Many of the scenes and circumstances recalled the days of the South Sea Scheme. The gambling in shares of companies which were formed only in name was without limit. The principal towns of the north established for that purpose stock exchanges of their own, and Leeds especially, one-fifth of whose population had been authoritatively described in the first session of the new parliament as dependent on the poor-rates, now boasted of a stock exchange which in the extent of its transactions rivalled that of the metropolis. And the gambling was universal, from the noble to the mechanic. It was confined to no class and to no sex. The scene which took place at the Board of Trade on the last day on which plans could be lodged, and when midnight had arrived while crowds from the country were still filling the

hall, and pressing at the doors, deserved and required for its adequate representation the genius of a Hogarth. This was the day on which it was announced that the total number of railway projects, on which deposits had been paid, had reached nearly to eight hundred.

What is remarkable in this vast movement in which so many millions were produced, and so many more promised, is, that the great leaders of the financial world took no part in it. The mighty loan-mongers, on whose fiat the fate of kings and empires sometimes depended, seemed like men who, witnessing some eccentricity of nature, watch it with mixed feelings of curiosity and alarm. Even Lombard Street, which never was more wanted, was inactive, and it was only by the irresistible pressure of circumstances that a banking firm which had an extensive country connection was ultimately forced to take the leading part that was required, and almost unconsciously lay the foundation of the vast fortunes which it has realised, and organise the varied connection which it now commands. All seemed to come from the provinces, and from unknown people in the provinces.' (Vol. iii. pp. 93-98.)

These glimpses of politics and history are to us the most interesting pages in these volumes, for they have a tinge of reality, which can hardly be predicated of the incidents which are crowded in the last half of the third volume. That Myra should marry Prince Florestan, after the death of Lord Roehampton, is so bold a device of fancy that we should reject it altogether if it were not for our knowledge of the fact that at one moment the hand of Prince Florestan went a-begging, and that more than one English young lady might have achieved the conquest and the position that Myra did not hesitate to accept. The vein of diluted Catholicism which runs through the scenes in which Nigel Penruddock figures, even when he returns as Archbishop of Tyre *in partibus*, is very inferior to the strong Roman element in 'Lothair.' There it was imposing, here it is ludicrous. And, above all, we are amazed to learn that the culminating point in the career of Endymion consists in his marrying a dowager countess with a large estate. Lord Beaconsfield appears to think that the anti-papal letter of Lord John Russell, elicited by the creation of the Romish hierarchy, led to the dissolution of the Cabinet—that is an unsubstantial theory; but as Lord Roehampton had already vanished from the scene (in this novel) the real causes of that event could not be traced to their origin. Indeed, it is remarkable that several of the most important occurrences of the last half-century, such as the accession of Queen Victoria, the Revolution of 1848, and the *coup d'état* of 1851, are very cursorily alluded to; and the consequences to which these events did really give birth are assigned to very inferior secondary causes. But the paragraph

in which Lord Beaconsfield relates the formation of the first cabinet in which he himself sat is too characteristic to be omitted :—

‘The Whigs tottered on for a year after the rude assault of Cardinal Penruddock, but they were doomed, and the Protectionists were called upon to form an administration. As they had no one in their ranks who had ever been in office except their chief, who was in the House of Lords, the affair seemed impossible. The attempt, however, could not be avoided. A dozen men, without the slightest experience of official life, had to be sworn in as privy councillors, before even they could receive the seals and insignia of their intended offices. On their knees, according to the constitutional custom, a dozen men, all in the act of genuflexion at the same moment, and headed, too, by one of the most powerful peers in the country, the Lord of Alnwick Castle himself, humbled themselves before a female Sovereign, who looked serene and imperturbable before a spectacle never seen before, and which, in all probability, will never be seen again. One of this band, a gentleman without any official experience whatever, was not only placed in the cabinet, but was absolutely required to become the leader of the House of Commons, which had never occurred before, except in the instance of Mr. Pitt in 1782. It has been said that it was unwise in the Protectionists assuming office when, on this occasion and on subsequent ones, they were far from being certain of a majority in the House of Commons. It should, however, be remembered, that unless they had dared these ventures, they never could have formed a body of men competent, from their official experience and their practice in debate, to form a ministry. The result has rather proved that they were right. Had they continued to refrain from incurring responsibility, they must have broken up and merged in different connections, which, for a party numerically so strong as the Protectionists, would have been a sorry business, and probably have led to disastrous results.’ (Vol. iii. pp. 319–321.)

Upon the whole, we close these volumes not without gratitude to the author for the amusement he has afforded us. It may be suspected that he is laughing all the time at society, at politics, at his readers. But what then? We can laugh with him. To take such a book *au grand sérieux*, as the French say, would be a mistake; but as a satirical picture of life, with the transformations of a Christmas pantomime, it has the merit of entertaining an enormous number of readers, from the cabinet minister at Whitehall, who throws aside his despatches to devour it, to the Californian miner or Australian shepherd, who will imagine that he finds in these pages some traces of what is happening in another hemisphere, though in this he might be a little mistaken. These are but the coloured shadows from the magic-lantern of life; the lamp within shines—we trust, with a purer and a steadier light.

ART. V.—*An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion.*
By JOHN CAIRD, D.D. Glasgow: 1880.

THE philosophy of religion is almost as old as religion itself.

No intelligent people can have a religion among them for any length of time before they inquire whence it came, what were the causes which produced it and what the reasons which justify it. The early attitude of faith is immediate, unquestioning, and uncritical; for it rejoices in the full assurance of the existence of Self of Nature and of God, without any consciousness of the logical relation of the elements thus bound together in thought. But the necessary movements of intellectual life inevitably disturb this state of simple consciousness, and the reason aspiring after a systematic and coherent knowledge separates the individual from the universal, and seeks for that deeper consciousness which it feels must underlie the consciousness of man and the consciousness of the world. Severe criticism opposes itself to simple faith, and a spiritual revolt is raised against the religious opinions and traditions of the day which are subjected to the test of a new standard. The attitude of the human spirit is now altered towards religion and religious ideas, which are taken out of the domain of feeling or practical experience and made objects of scientific analysis. The analysis has in view a higher and more rational synthesis. The new synthesis is not a final solution of the problem of religion, for it becomes, in its turn, subject to fresh analysis. Thus the critical age clears the ground for the creative age, with its promise of an original and richly endowed future; and the progress of religious knowledge becomes marked by alternating periods of criticism and creation, which are so bound together by intermediate links of progressive evolution, that they may be said to constitute one organic whole.

Without the spirit of criticism, which regards religion as an object for scientific reflection, religious ideas would become petrified—no reform, no reformation, no new religion, would be possible. It lies at the root of all progress, and we may discern its influence in the early dawn of the religious consciousness of mankind. In the Vedas, for instance, we see a childlike, simple faith in the god Indra: ‘When the fiery Indra hurls down the thunderbolt, then people put faith in him;’* but this faith is soon abandoned for the colder region

* Rig-Veda, i. 55. 5. ‘Alte tonantem credidimus Jovem.’ The

in which reason opposes the object of faith: 'There is no 'Indra.' Who has seen him?'* We observe it in Greece, when Herakleitos investigated the nature of religion as a 'sacred disease,' or when Thales thought he had discovered that water is the beginning of all things, and so implied that the gods had not made the world. It was not, however, until the middle of the last century that the critical spirit commenced a thoroughly scientific investigation of the claims of religion, or that a philosophy of religion began to take shape and form. The age of Kant was the age of criticism *par excellence*: 'Religion on the ground of its sanctity, and Law on the 'ground of its majesty,' he said, 'often resist the sifting of 'their claims. But in so doing they inevitably awake a not 'unjust suspicion that their claims are ill-founded; and they 'can no longer expect the unfeigned homage paid by reason 'to that which has shown itself able to stand the test of free 'inquiry.' This is the thought which underlies the work of Kant.† It is that which inspired Hegel, who claimed for philosophy the function of apprehending by means of thought the same truths which the religious mind apprehends by faith.‡ In our own day a great impetus has been given to the study of the philosophy of religion by the discovery of the ancient sacred literatures, which have opened up to historical research the principal religions of mankind. These historical religions have thrown such fresh light upon the origin and development of religious ideas, both from a historical and a philosophical point of view, that they imperatively demand a readjustment of much of the religious § thought current amongst us. The

word used for faith in the Rig-Veda, *sraddhâ*, is the same word which reappears in the Latin *credo*, and in our own *creed*. 'That word and 'that thought therefore existed before the Aryan family broke up. . . . 'Even at this early period people believed what neither their senses 'could apprehend nor their reason comprehend. . . . They had formed 'a word for belief—that is, they were conscious of what they were 'doing in thus believing, and they consecrated that mental function by 'calling it *srad-dhâ*.' (Max Müller, 'Hibbert Lectures,' p. 301.)

* Rig-Veda, viii. 100. 3.

† Professor Edward Caird's 'Critical Account of the Philosophy of 'Kant.'

‡ *Vermischte Schriften*, ii. 520, quoted by Mr. Wallace in the 'Logic of Hegel.'

§ A systematic study of the historical religions is much facilitated by the publication of the 'Sacred Books of the East' (Clarendon Press). Professor Max Müller may perhaps somewhat overstate the importance of the historical religions as affecting the problem of religion when he says: 'I feel certain that the time will come when all

readjustment of thought seems as needful in the sphere of religion as in the other sciences, where the chemical tables have been altered on account of a change in the atom of hydrogen, and the astronomical been readjusted because of the new measurement of the sun's distance.

Principal Caird's 'Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion' is the latest and most important contribution to the literature of the subject. It bears the marks of the intellectual movement inaugurated by Kant, and followed up by Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel; and it is judiciously illustrated by the history of the great religions of the world, which supply materials that were unknown to the earlier German philosophers. The name of Hegel is not mentioned, but the influence of the master is felt throughout—the Hegelian philosophy is the keynote to the book. To borrow philosophy from Hegel is, says Sir Alexander Grant, 'like borrowing poetry from Shakspeare, a debt that is almost inevitable.' Although it was Hegel's ambition to make philosophy speak German, as Luther had made the Bible, and Voss had made Homer, yet he is confessedly hard to understand: 'One man has understood me,' he is reported to have said, 'and even he has not.' To Dr. Caird we are indebted for a subtle and masterly presentation of Hegel's philosophy in its solution of the problem of religion. In addition to the literary skill which places his propositions in their brightest light, and an earnestness of purpose which at times rises into genuine eloquence, he possesses two qualifications which specially fit him for his work: a spirit of reverence which places him in sympathy with mystical and intuitionist minds, even when he is freely criticising their effort to elevate the dictates of feeling above systematic theology; and an intellectual vigour which enables him to stand side by side with the ablest thinkers, to view the utmost border of their extended range of vision, and, while he treats them with chivalrous fairness, to grapple with their arguments. He hopes to show that the elaborate reasonings of the philosopher may blend into one harmonious chord with the simple aspirations of mankind, that the subjects with which religion is concerned are those which have occupied philosophy, and that it is the function of philosophy to interpret the meaning and explain the true significance of

'that is now written on theology, whether from an ecclesiastical or philosophical point of view, will seem as antiquated, as strange, as unaccountable, as the works of Vossius and others by the side of Bopp's "Comparative Grammar."' (Science of Religion, p. 22.)

the religious experiences of mankind: 'Religion, so far from forming an exception to the all-embracing sphere of philosophy, is rather just that province which lies nearest to it; for in one point of view religion and philosophy have common objects and a common content, and in the explanation of religion philosophy may be said to be at the same time explaining itself.'

Faith and thought are thus regarded as different attitudes of the human spirit towards the same objects. Faith sees them in an immediate way as objects of devotion or spiritual enjoyment, thought regards them as objects of reflection, and elevates them to the form of pure or speculative thought. These attitudes of the human spirit, so far from being antagonistic, are in perfect harmony. All religious feeling contains in it implicitly an element of knowledge, and all knowledge presupposes feeling. Religion is a thing of the heart; but in order to elevate it above the region of subjective caprice, to distinguish between the true and the false in religion, and to separate the higher from the lower religions, we must have an objective standard. Religious feeling must be based on objective truth. The ultimate arbiter in religion is not subjective notions and impressions which are ever changing, but the objective authority of reason itself. The purest and most intense feeling is necessary in religion; but an intelligent basis can only be laid for religion when we pass beyond the feeling to the character of the object about which we feel, and which determines the intensity of the feeling. Dr. Caird rightly, therefore, rejects the false or defective psychology which makes religion characteristically either a thing of knowledge or a thing of feeling, and finds its foundation in the very essence of our nature as rational and spiritual beings: 'God and Divine things may touch our feelings, kindle our emotions, awaken in us desires and impulses, dominate our practical activities; but underneath and throughout all these there must be present the activity of that organ which alone can raise us above ourselves, which alone can bring us into relation to the things unseen and eternal, and that organ is thought.' The intuitive and the reflective are two stages through which human thought must pass, and our religious ideas are carried beyond the domain of feeling or practical experience to become objects of scientific reflection:—

'Abandoning the blessedness of simple faith, we enter into that colder yet loftier region in which reason opposes itself to its object, breaks up the natural harmony wherein no contradiction of thought has yet betrayed itself, and advances to the search after a deeper and

indissoluble unity. . . . The aim of philosophy is to discover not what seems, but what is and why it is; to bind objects and events in the links of necessary thought, and to find their last ground and reason in that which comprehends and transcends all—the nature of God Himself.’ (P. 3.)

Dr. Caird rejects the position which regards God as a transcendent Being in the solitude of the world beyond, and with Hegel he regards Him as a Being in the actuality and plenitude of the world in which we live, whose presence is reflected in all order and beauty, ‘in all thinking things, and all objects ‘of all thought.’ He finds the true solution of the higher problem of religion, as the relation of the Finite Mind to God, ‘by apprehending the Divine and the Human, the Infinite and the Finite, as the moments or members of an organic ‘whole, in which both exist, at once in their distinction and ‘their unity;’ he recognises the latent grandeur of man’s nature in the affinity it bears to that which is universal and infinite, which enables him to transcend the Finite, to rise above the world of inner and outer experience, and to apprehend the Universal or Absolute Mind, as that in which alone our mind can find its ultimate explanation; and he endeavours to show that man can attain to knowledge, in the philosophic sense of the word, within the sphere of religion—not indeed by ordinary thinking, which, though it may suffice for practical piety, is yet inadequate as an instrument of scientific thought, but by an ‘organon of thought, by means of which he can ‘perceive and correct the inadequacy of ordinary thinking, ‘and apprehend spiritual realities in their purely ideal form.’

And here let us pause to consider the meaning attached to the words which we use in the phrase, ‘Philosophy of ‘Religion.’

Religion as an aspiration after God, and a desire for union with Him, is grounded on the relation of the human spirit to the Divine, and arises from a necessity in our nature as intellectual and spiritual beings: ‘Quia fecisti nos ad te, et inquietum est cor nostrum donec requiescat in te.’* That ‘all ‘men crave for the gods’ is as true in our day as in the days of Homer.† Wherever we go, from the highest culture to

* S. Aug. ‘Conf.’ i. 1.

† πάντες δὲ θεῶν χατέουσ’ ἄνθρωποι. (Od. iii. 48.) ‘Qu’on n’espère ‘donc pas se passer de religion ni d’associations religieuses. Chaque ‘progrès des sociétés modernes rendra ce besoin-là plus impérieux.’ is the latest utterance of M. Renan. (Conférences d’Angleterre, p. 38.)

the lowest barbarism, we find religion as a web running through the warp of history, and recognise it as that element which gives to man in the midst of creation his spiritual elevation and dignity. The upturned face and the hands stretched towards heaven are outward symbols of the attitude or activity of thought which places the human spirit in the presence of the Divine, and awakens in it the longing desire after God as the highest ideal of which it is intellectually and spiritually capable. The ideal of religion, the infinitude of thought and goodness latent within us, is capable of infinite expansion. But while on the one hand it must dwarf every actual attainment of goodness and knowledge, and so remain for ever unrealised, yet on the other hand the infinite nature of man is always moving towards its complete realisation. The spiritual life of man not only foreshadows an ideal that forbids us to remain satisfied with the present, it also imparts the impulse to make our actual life adequate to its ideal form. But since the actual life never attains its ideal of perfection—since we have a consciousness of what we ought to be, and a knowledge of what we actually are—there arises the storm and strife between our two selves, the higher and truer self of reason and the lower self of appetite, between the Divine and the Human, the Infinite and the Finite, out of which all spiritual development is to be perfected. Philosophy, which aims at unity, presupposes and explains this discord; and religion, which aims at peace, offers for it a practical solution.

No adequate definition of religion* has yet been proposed, nor indeed is any possible, because religion, as the practical solution of the relation or attitude of the Human spirit to the Divine, is always passing through some stage of historic evolution. It has, however, in popular usage, at least two meanings which must be distinguished. Sometimes it means that ‘silent power working in the heart of man,’ which aspires after and seeks rest in the Infinite—the Infinite which transcends

* The derivation of the word does not much help us. Cicero derives it from *relegere*, to gather up again, hence to lay up and ponder over: ‘Qui omnia quæ ad cultum deorum pertinerent, diligenter retractarent et tanquam relegerent, sunt dicti religiosi.’ (De Nat. Deor. ii. 28.) Lactantius may be wrong in his etymology, but he has struck a true note when he connects religion with the idea of an obligation by which we are bound to God: ‘Vinculo pietatis obstricti, Deo religati sumus, unde ipsa religio nomen cepit.’ (Inst. Div. iv. 28.) So also Augustine, ‘Retract.’ i. 13. See Nietzsche, ‘Theol. Stud. u. Krit.’ i. 532. We must bear in mind that the English word religion comprehends in it much more than the Latin *religio*.

the Finite, and comprehends all finite things and thoughts. In this acceptation Dr. Caird defines religion as 'simply the 'return of the Finite consciousness into union with the Infinite, the reconciliation of the Human spirit with the Divine,'* and he describes the religious experience of man as the endeavour to find rest in making himself one with the Infinite Thought and Being by the self-surrender of his human will to the Divine.

The term religion is also applied to those theological doctrines, handed down by tradition, and recorded in the sacred books of mankind, which constitute the faith of Hindus, Buddhists, and others. These doctrines are the logical development of what is latent and implicit in the religious feeling of mankind. They are the outward expression of the continuous and progressive movements of thought which the nations have made in their search after the Infinite, in whom they 'live, and 'move, and have their being.' They are the efforts by which human thought is compelled to try and solve that great mystery which is ever pressing for solution—the existence of the world and the enigmas of its life. The various solutions of the problem of religion centre round the idea of God and man's relation to Him. Nations repose on the religious life. 'The idea of 'God,' says Hegel, 'constitutes the general foundation of a 'people. Whatever is the form of a religion the same is the 'form of the State and its constitution, which spring from religion, so that the Athenian and the Roman States were only 'possible with the peculiar heathendom of their people.'† The history of the religions of the world does not, therefore, present a record of so many failures in the attempt to find a practical solution of the relation between man and God, but of the un-

* Hegel regards religion as the effort of the soul to realise its unity with the Absolute:—

'God only to behold and know and feel,
Till by exclusive consciousness of God
All self annihilated, it shall make
God its identity.'

Prof. Flint's 'Philosophy of History,' p. 510.

† This thought of Hegel was partially expressed by Plutarch: 'Me thinks a man should sooner find a city built in the air, without any 'plot of ground whereon it is seated, than that any commonwealth 'altogether void of religion and the opinion of the gods should either 'be first established, or afterwards preserved and maintained in that 'estate. This is that containeth and holdeth together all human 'society; this is the foundation, prop, and stay of all.' (Adv. Colot. 31.)

folding of successive experiences which are real and permanent, in that they contain within themselves the spirit and the promise of the religious future of the world. That future is the representative of the past changed by the power of a new creative spiritual force, and transfigured into a higher and nobler conception, which, in its turn, is to be merged into yet loftier and more adequate forms of thought.

Both these significations of the word—religion as an aspiration of the heart, and religions as successive movements of thought within the sphere of the Infinite—imply the existence of the universal or ideal element of religion, which, while it continues *constant* under all forms, is ever realising and expressing itself in particular forms. This ideal element is based upon certain necessary relations between man the finite and God the Infinite. To unfold these relations between man and God as experienced in the heart, and to trace the movement of thought concerning God and divine things which the several positive religions represent, is the work of a Philosophy of Religion. The Philosophy of Religion is defined by Dr. Caird to be simply ‘a conscious development of the process which is given implicitly in religious feelings and acts—the process by which the finite spirit loses or abnegates its finitude and self-sufficiency, and finds its truer self in the life and being of God.’ Philosophy is the intelligent comprehension of facts with a view to their complete unification. The philosophy of religion seeks for the complete unification of the facts of religion, not the external and superficial unity of appearances, but the unity of thought, of law, of organic development, in one word, the unity of principle which underlies all diversity of phenomena and embraces them in thought. As the highest interpreter of the facts of experience, philosophy passes beyond the particular experiences of mankind that it may grasp the universal or ideal element which realises and expresses itself in the particular. Moving in the sphere of a wider and more general experience, philosophy corrects the narrower and more limited religious ideas which the mind of the individual and the intellectual movement of the nation have evolved, and so approximates to the laws which govern the spiritual progress of mankind. ‘The peculiar domain of philosophy is absolute truth;’ and philosophy enables the mind, in its thoughts of God and divine things, to escape from the narrow limits of its own individuality, and to enter the region of universal and absolute truth.

I. These are high functions to claim for the Philosophy of Religion, and we are therefore met at the outset of our enquiry

by the question, Can philosophy justify its claim; can we have a scientific treatment of religious ideas; must philosophy be confined within the sphere of the finite and relative, or is its peculiar domain absolute truth? At first sight it would seem that men of science no less than theologians are ready to admit that religion must be treated as a subject of science. Mr. Herbert Spencer, for instance, admits the claim:

‘He who contemplates the universe from the religious point of view must learn to see that this which we call science is one constituent of the great whole, and as such ought to be regarded with a sentiment like that which the remainder excites; while he who contemplates the universe from the scientific point of view must learn to see that this which we call Religion is similarly a constituent of the great whole, and, being such, must be treated as a subject of science with no more prejudice than any other reality. It behoves each party to strive to understand the other, with the conviction that the other has something worthy to be understood, and with the conviction that, when mutually recognised, this something will be the basis of a complete reconciliation.’*

But it is evident that while Mr. Spencer and Dr. Caird both claim a place for religion as a constituent of the great whole, and a subject of science, yet they differ *toto cælo* as to the basis on which a complete reconciliation between religion and science is to be effected. They differ, that is, as to the ultimate truth which both can avow with absolute sincerity, the fundamental verity in the defence of which each will find the other its faithful ally. Mr. Spencer finds the basis of reconciliation in what he considers to be the ‘deepest, widest, and most certain of all facts—that the power which the universe manifests to us is ‘utterly inscrutable.’† ‘Only in a doctrine which recognises the unknown cause as coextensive with all orders of phenomena, can there be a consistent religion or a consistent philosophy. . . . The reality underlying appearance is totally and for ever inconceivable by us . . . and from the very nature of our intelligence it must be so.’‡ In other words, he asserts that we may have a science of nature and of man, but that a science of God and of divine things we cannot have, because it is precluded by the fact that we cannot know anything about the Infinite except as the bare negation of the finite; and that philosophy must be confined within the sphere of the relative and the finite, because we cannot attain to absolute truth. Dr. Caird, on the contrary, maintains that the object

First Principles, p. 21.

† Ibid. p. 46.

‡ Ibid. p. 557 seq.

of our religious aspirations is contemplated as 'something more than the unknown, and that we must conceive of that in Him which lies beyond our knowledge as, though unknown, *not* unknowable;' and that 'the grandeur which surrounds the thought of the Absolute, the infinite Reality beyond the finite, can only arise from this, not that it is something utterly inconceivable and unthinkable, but that it is for thought or self-consciousness the realisation of its highest ideal of spiritual excellence.' While Mr. Spencer apparently finds the ideal of the philosophico-religion in an attitude of awe and veneration before the altar to the Unknown and the Unknowable, Dr. Caird thinks that for the human spirit the knowledge and the love of God are eternal life.

The question whether a scientific treatment of religious ideas is possible, is thus brought to a direct issue, Do all the doctrines of religion belong to the sphere of the Unknowable? The answer returned to this question depends upon the admission or the denial to man of the power to apprehend, in their purely ideal form, spiritual realities which cannot be perceived by the senses, or generalised out of the facts and phenomena which sense perceives—realities which 'eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath entered the heart of man.' Several answers have been given to this question. One school of thinkers says that God is the Unknowable; another, that the only knowledge which is here possible of God is intuitive and immediate not ratiocinative, the organ of religious knowledge being simply faith or feeling, not reason; while a third maintains that religious truth differs from all other truth in that it has been authoritatively revealed, which implies the incompetence of human reason either to discover or to criticise its contents. If any of these three views be tenable, it is obvious that the construction of a Philosophy of Religion is impossible. Dr. Caird, however, contends that we can attain to the cognisance of that which is infinite and absolute in another way: 'All finite thought rests on the presumption of an Infinite and Absolute Thought—God reveals Himself in thought and to it—Rational or speculative knowledge is, in one point of view, man's knowledge of God, and is in another God's knowledge of Himself.'

Now it is to be observed at the outset of the inquiry, that when Dr. Caird claims for a religion, which implies a knowledge of God, rank among the sciences, he does not assert it to be an inductive science based upon the generalised phenomena of the world of the senses, because no amount of generalisation from the finite can ever enable us to apprehend the

true Infinite; it only leads up to a false infinite, which consists of endless additions of finite magnitude—a 'quantitative infinite,' which is a contradiction in terms. He says that the logical understanding cannot attain to the ultimate problems of thought, for spiritual realities are related to each other in subtler ways than its forms and methods can grasp; that ordinary thought can only embrace the phenomena of the world under relations of ever-deepening unity, until it reaches the highest finite unity, that of thought or self-consciousness in man; but that it is quite inadequate to rise above those external and accidental relations which belong to the sphere of the finite, and attain to the highest ideal knowledge—the knowledge in which the form is adequate to the content, and the ideal element is grasped in its purity and in its internal coherence and harmony. The logical understanding fails as a final organon of knowledge, because when it has disintegrated the universe it cannot restore the scattered elements to the perfect unity in which the parts are so held together as to constitute one self-consistent system of truth. But thought, he maintains, is capable of another and deeper movement. The analytic syllogism with its movement of identity is not the only movement of thought; there is a synthesis of thought by which the imperfect and inadequate idea leads to one more perfect and adequate. The 'immanent logic of religion'—the logic, that is, which underlies the elevation of human thought from the finite to the infinite—is not reducible to syllogistic rule because it is synthetic and not merely analytic, because it involves difference as well as identity, and because it has a negative as well as a positive side. There is in man an 'organon of thought by means of which he can perceive and correct the inadequacy of ordinary thinking, and apprehend spiritual realities in their purely ideal form.' It is this organon of thought which makes it possible to advance from faith to science, to attain, in the sphere of religion, to knowledge in the philosophic sense of the word, and to rise to that deeper and truer universality which may be designated 'ideal or organic universality.' This ideal or organic universality is altogether different from the barren and formal universality of generalisation; it indicates a movement of thought corresponding to an inner relation of things, and is the result of a process of development of 'perpetual affirmation and negation, which, while it has annulled all the prior stages of its history, has absorbed and re-affirmed each and all of them in its own perfect unity.' Thus thought grasps the perfect idea, the idea of the completely developed or perfect organism,

which is 'that eternal order and system of which universal truth consists, and which is only another name for Him who is the beginning and the end, the source and the consummation of all thought and being.'

It will thus be seen that Dr. Caird bases his philosophy of religion upon the existence in man of a special 'organon of thought,' which is necessary for the 'immanent logic of religion.' But even assuming that such an organon of thought exists for apprehending spiritual realities (which is doubtful), yet we think that all that can be claimed for the 'logic of religion' is that while it may be a very practical logic it is not rigorously scientific, and cannot establish a basis for a philosophy of religion. Proofs which cannot be reduced to syllogistic forms, and which do not obey syllogistic laws, cannot be regarded as deductive in the ordinary and only legitimate sense of the term. Dr. Caird, however, thinks that it does furnish an adequate basis, and contends that not only can we attain to a scientific knowledge in the sphere of religion, but that, in a certain sense, we *must*, because the mind is impelled onward, by its own inward dialectic, until it finds its goal in a thought which is universal and absolute—the Absolute Thought or Intelligence in which all finite thought and being rest.

It would seem, indeed, that Mr. Herbert Spencer has himself been carried on, by the momentum of thought, somewhat further in the knowledge of the Absolute than he is justified in going by the theory of the 'relativity of human knowledge.' In obedience to this theory he regards the Absolute as a mere negative abstraction and utterly inscrutable, and yet he assures us that the 'positive existence of the Absolute' is a necessary datum of consciousness, of which, so long as consciousness continues, we cannot for an instant get rid:—

'By the laws of thought we are rigorously prevented from forming a conception of absolute existence; and we are by the laws of thought equally prevented from ridding ourselves of the consciousness of absolute existence. . . . Our consciousness of the unconditioned being literally the unconditioned consciousness, or raw material of thought to which, in thinking, we give definite forms, it follows that an ever-present sense of real existence is the very basis of our intelligence.' *

In fact, Mr. Spencer cannot leave the Unknowable unknown: he predicates its existence. The logical impossibility of taking this step from conditioned existence to unconditioned existence, and yet remaining consistent with his theory, is very clearly

* First Principles, chap. iv.

stated by Dr. Caird. He says that Mr. Spencer cannot hold that human intelligence is limited to the finite, and assert at the same time that it is cognisant of an existence beyond the finite. If all knowledge be relative, he cannot know the *existence* of the Non-relative or the Absolute. If he starts with the assertion that thought is, by its necessary conditions, finite and subjective, and that the Absolute is only another name for that which is out of relation to thought, he cannot, 'save by an act of violence, drag in a consciousness, in any sense, of the Absolute, in order to meet the exigencies of his theory.'

'We cannot deny all consciousness of the Absolute in order to maintain that human knowledge is limited, and in the same breath assert a consciousness of the Absolute in order to justify our cognisance of that limitation. In so far as the lower animals are devoid of reason, they are unconscious of their irrationality, and it is only *we*, in virtue of our rational, intelligent nature, who can discern the lack of it. So it might be possible for another and higher intelligence, an observer of human intelligence possessed of absolute knowledge, to pronounce that man's knowledge is purely relative, that there is a region of realities from which human thought is shut out, but it is not possible for one and the same consciousness to be purely relative and conscious of its relativity. Grant the fundamental assumption of the theorist, and it follows that humanity is not only hopelessly ignorant of reality, but also absolutely unconscious of its ignorance.' (p. 18.)

There seems no escape in Mr. Spencer's theory from the illogical affirmations of a finite which has in thought no correlative infinite, and a relative which has in thought no correlative absolute. When he separates reality from thought, the residuum is not an unknown *something*,* it is simply utter non-entity. That only has a reality for us which is capable of entering into thought, and is in itself thinkable reality, for thought is presupposed in all objective reality. Thought postulates itself; that is, it postulates the thought which is prior to all individual thinking, and which is ever manifesting and realising itself in 'all thinking things, all objects of all thought.' Therefore the logical conclusion of the doctrine of

* 'The sense of a something that is conditioned in every thought cannot be got rid of, because the something cannot be got rid of. . . . By fusing a series of states of consciousness, in each of which, as it arises, the limitations and conditions are abolished, there is produced 'a consciousness of something unconditioned.' (First Principles, p. 95.) No doubt, but then the inference is not that a belief in the existence of the absolute is consistent with this theory, but that his theory is wrong because it logically precludes such a belief.

relativity is 'not that the absolute is unknowable, but that no such being exists, or, what comes to the same thing, that the assertion of its existence is meaningless.'

The theory of the relativity of human knowledge is not set forth by Mr. Spencer as subversive of religion, or as depriving religion of any place in the spiritual life of man; on the contrary, he finds a place for our religious aspirations in the region where all is mystery, and enunciates as a fundamental article of the philosophico-religious creed, the existence of the Absolute as a 'power of which the nature remains for ever inconceivable, and to which no limits in time or space can be imagined,' as the unknown Reality of which matter, motion, and force are the symbols.* Still less is it so regarded by Dean Mansel, who advocated the theory with the view of showing that this essential weakness of human nature required a supernatural revelation, and that reason must therefore give place to faith as the sole organ of religious knowledge. But it is obvious that 'if thought is, by its very nature, imprisoned in the relative, supernatural aid can no more communicate to it a knowledge of the Absolute than it can convey ideas of colour to a man born blind. Not even a revelation from heaven can introduce into the finite mind a kind of knowledge which, without ceasing to be finite, it cannot attain.'

II. But it is not sufficient for Dr. Caird to show that Mr. Spencer is carried further in his desire to know The Unknowable than is consistent with his theory, he is himself required to show why the human mind *must* rise to the knowledge of God. This he does by contending that 'finite knowledge, as finite, is illusory and false; and that all true knowledge contains in it an absolute and infinite element.' We shall endeavour to explain this position by his treatment of such questions as the origin of religion and the proofs of the existence of God.

One of the earliest problems which a philosophy of religion has to solve is that which relates to the origin of religion. And here we must distinguish between the historical beginning of a thing and its essential principle or its origin in thought. The beginning of Raphael's picture of the Transfiguration was the first line which he drew upon the canvas; the true origin was the creative ideal of the perfected work which existed in the master's mind, which guided the first stroke, inspired its progress, and only ceased when his hand lay cold in death. In Religion it is not to the beginning, but to the ideal end, that we

* First Principles, p. 557.

must look for the true origin and explanation of its history. The beginning is found in the fetishism of savage nations; but the true origin, the ultimate final cause, is seen in religion as conceived in its ideal perfection. Many writers seem satisfied that they have solved the problem when they trace the beginning of the historical religions not to what is highest, but to what is lowest in human nature—not to a longing after an ideal excellence which endeavours to realise itself in the actual experience of their daily life, but to the element of fear which manifests itself in cowardice towards the supernatural.* Now, even if religion be defined so as to include the childishnesses of savage life, yet as our estimate of a work of art is not founded on the rudeness of the artist's first efforts but on the final result—the triumph of achievement being enhanced and not diminished by a knowledge of early difficulties successfully overcome—as the mind of man is what it is, even though it had its first beginnings in a zoophyte,† so the worth of the great historic religions is to be appraised by the degrees of excellence to which they have attained in their evolution of the idea of the infinite, as well as by the nobility of character and beauty of spiritual life which that idea has developed among their followers—and this even though the first beginnings, the tentative lines of the pencil, can be traced to fear and cowardice. The true origin of religion is not found in the attitude of the savage towards his fetish, but in the attitude of the reflecting mind which, impressed by the consciousness of the transitory, unsubstantial, evanescent character of the world of which we form a part, is urged on to seek for some reality beyond. It is here that Dr. Caird finds for religion its true origin. That the things seen are tem-

* *Δεισιδαιμονία* (from *δεῖδω*) had at first an honourable use, and is so employed by St. Paul in his discourse upon Mars Hill at Athens. The philosophers turned it to ignobler uses, as Theophrastus does when he defines it to be simply 'cowardice in regard to the supernatural' (*δειλία πρὸς τὰ δαιμόνια*), and describes it as the character of the man who 'washes his hands at a fountain, sprinkles himself from a temple-font, puts a bit of laurel-leaf into his mouth, and so goes about for the day.' Cowardice (*δειλία*) he defines as 'a shrinking of the soul through fear.' St. Augustine distinguishes between the noble and the ignoble use:—'*Varro religiosum a superstizioso eâ distinctione discernit, ut a superstizioso dicat timeri Deos; a religioso autem vereri ut parentes, non ut hostes timeri.*' (De Civ. Dei, vi. 9.)

† 'Dans l'ordre de l'idéal la naissance n'est rien; chacun vaut en proportion de ce qu'il découvre de vérité, de ce qu'il réalise de bien.' E. Renan, 'Conférences d'Angleterre,' p. 122.

poral implies that there is a truth and reality beyond which is eternal, that our knowledge is relative implies that there is an Absolute, that we are conscious of our own finitude contains a latent consciousness of the Infinite which denies and contradicts it. 'Our days,' says the Hebrew Psalmist, 'are like a shadow that declineth, but Thou, O Lord, shalt endure for ever.'

The consciousness of the vanity and insufficiency of this world lies at the root of all religion, and discovers to man the need of an abiding Reality as the object of his spiritual reverence and awe. In this we find the germ of the idea of God. This germ contains within it the promise of a God in whom are 'hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.' Nevertheless, the utmost that we actually gain from the consciousness of the insufficiency and unreality of the finite is the idea of an infinite which transcends it and is its negation—'ein negativer Abstraktionsbegriff.' This is the first, as it is a necessary, step in the development of the idea of God. It is the imperfect and inadequate idea which leads up to one more perfect and adequate. The mind of man cannot rest in a negative abstraction; it is forced out of this imperfect conception to grasp the idea of the truer and higher Infinite which realises itself in Nature and in Man, the idea which shows that the Finite and the Infinite, the Human and Divine, Man and God, are not isolate and separate, but are members or moments of one organic whole, in which both exist at once in their distinction and in their unity. Now it is by tracing the genesis and the stages of the onward movement of the mind in its search after higher and more adequate ideas of God, that we obtain the best proof of the reality of that idea, because then the reason 'grasps the inner, genetic nature of its object, enters into the very process of its formation, and so recreates it for thought.'

The true interpretation of the so-called proofs of the existence of God is seen by tracing the successive steps which thought takes in its own necessary movements. These proofs, viewed simply as proofs in the ordinary sense of the word, lie open to the gravest objections, and since the time of Kant no one has ventured to repeat the old arguments in the old form. But when we regard them as an analysis of the 'unconscious' or implicit logic of religion, they form so many successive steps in the ladder by which the human spirit rises above the finite, and through imperfect and inadequate conceptions of God reaches after those which are higher and more adequate. Dr. Caird examines the three proofs of the Being of God, which

are known as the Cosmological, the Teleological, and the Ontological. He shows wherein they fail as arguments; and he then claims these very failures, these flaws in the argument, as steps in the process which he calls the 'implicit logic of religion.'

The first so-called proof is the Cosmological, the argument *a contingentia mundi*. Briefly it is stated thus: The contingent world exists, therefore an absolutely necessary Being exists. That is, in order to explain the existence of the world the mind postulates the existence of Something outside the world, and so seeks rest in the idea of a Being who is necessary and self-dependent. This necessary Being must be the *ens realissimum*, the Being that includes all reality, for such a Being alone rests on itself, and has all the conditions of existence in itself. The mind, seeking for a cause which shall explain the world, reasons back to a First Cause, a Being which is its own cause, and is therefore unconditioned and necessary. Now, if we put this argument into the form of a syllogistic proof of the existence of God, we altogether misinterpret its meaning, for, as we have already pointed out, it leads through an endless series of finite causes to a cause which is itself no more than finite. To assert of this final cause that it is infinite and unconditioned is a purely arbitrary assumption. An Infinite which is merely an infinite series of finites is a quantitative infinite, and not the true infinite which both embraces and explains the finite. A necessary Being who is merely the negation of the contingent cannot be truly the Infinite or Absolute, but simply another contingent. As a proof of the existence of God this argument fails; but the process of thought through which the mind has attained to the idea of an Infinite which is the negation of the finite, of a Reality which denies the unreal and the transient, contains a truth which is a stepping-stone towards a higher and nobler idea. The idea of the non-finite is not false, but it is inadequate. It is the first dawn of the religious feeling which gives the fair promise of the coming day; it is the germ in the mind of man of the idea of God, which contains within itself the blossom and the fruit.

The mind cannot rest in the idea of an Infinite which is the mere negation of the finite; it is impelled forward to find an idea which shall be more adequate to its need. This it finds in the idea of an Infinite whose existence explains itself, and explains the existence of the finite world. This idea is arrived at by the Teleological, or the Argument from Design. Seldom has the argument been better stated than by Cicero: 'Who-

‘ever thinks that the wonderful order and incredible constancy of the heavenly bodies and their motions are not governed by an Intelligent Being is himself void of understanding. For shall we, when we see an artificial machine, a sphere or a dial, acknowledge at first sight that it is the work of art and understanding, and make any doubt that the heavens are the work not only of reason, but of an excellent and divine reason?’* This argument transferring ideas borrowed from art to the relation between God and the world, gains the idea of an all-wise Designer as a Cause which is self-conscious and self-determined before it determines anything else, and as One who adapts means to ends by his infinite power and infinite forethought. Attractive as this argument from design has always been to the popular mind, in that it elevates our view of nature and brings it into accord with our moral feelings, yet as a logical argument it fails to prove the existence of God. If, indeed, we knew beforehand the nature of God, we might conclude from it that the imperfections and anomalies of the world, inexplicable though they be, are yet grounded in infinite wisdom and goodness; but Nature is too imperfect, the enigmas of life are too difficult, to enable us to discover *everywhere* marks of the hand of an all-wise and all-loving Designer—‘Nature, red in tooth and claw with ravine,’ shrieks against the creed. Kant rightly contended that we cannot say what is the relation of the greatness of the world to perfect wisdom or to absolute unity.

But although as a logical argument the proof from design fails, yet it forms a second and an upward stage on which to rest in the mind’s progress towards a yet higher and nobler conception. This conception we find in the Ontological argument, which sees the proof of the existence of God in the very idea of God—the thought of God in the mind demonstrates His being. This is the argument from thought to being, and is the attempt to extract being out of thought. It may be differently stated according as the idea of perfection or the idea of *omnitudo realitatis* is made the middle term, but in both cases the point of the argument is the same: that which must be thought of as existing, necessarily exists. There is one idea which we must think of as existing, one idea which we cannot think away or suppose to be non-existent, one idea which so proves its reality to thought that thought itself becomes impossible without it, one idea whose ‘absolute objective reality is so fundamental to thought, that to doubt it implies

* De Nat. Deor. ii. 38.

'the subversion of all thought and all existence alike,' viz., thought itself. Thought postulates itself; thought cannot think an existence which is prior to, or outside of, or behind thought, or which has no relation to thought. To doubt the priority of thought, or the ultimate unity of thought and being, is impossible, because, in doubting it, we are tacitly asserting the thing we doubt. And this objective reality does not depend upon any individual thought, upon consciousness with its distinction of ego and non-ego—there was a time when we were not, and a time when we shall not be to perceive and know, yet the world was and shall be—but upon a 'higher, wider, more comprehensive thought or consciousness which embraces and is the unity of both, and is the universal life of all intelligences, or the life of universal absolute intelligence.' As all scientific knowledge proceeds on the presumption of the uniformity of nature, so all finite thought rests upon the tacit presumption of an absolute and infinite Thought or Mind, which is the *prius* of all things.

The ontological proof rightly interpreted regards God as the Infinite Mind or Self-consciousness on which the conscious life of all finite minds is based, which is necessarily related to or manifested in the world and yet through the world returns upon itself, and which is 'not a mere subjective notion or conception, but one which carries with it the proof of its necessary existence or reality.'

The true interpretation, therefore, of these three proofs is only seen when we regard them as representing successive steps of that process in which the human spirit rises above the finite, and is forced onward by the immanent logic of the religious life, from imperfect to gradually higher and more adequate conceptions of the object of religion. It is this process, moreover, that gives the highest proof of the reality of the idea. For when we have proved a truth by looking on and following the path which thought takes in its own necessary movements, then the result we reach is grasped with a clearness and certitude which it is impossible to exceed; for this is a process in which the intelligence identifies itself, so to speak, with the object to be known, or in which the process by which we reach the truth is, at the same time, the proof that it is the truth.

Nevertheless this process which has led us, on the assumption of the ultimate unity of thought and being, to the idea of God as Infinite Mind, only gives a very attenuated Theism; and we are constrained to ask: How are we to conceive of this ultimate basis of thought, this Reality on which all intelligence

rests? To this question Dr. Caird rightly replies that it is one which cannot be answered directly, seeing that 'all human knowledge, which is the gradual bringing of this Reality to self-consciousness, may be said to be the never exhausted answer to it,' for it is absurd to talk of our knowing or realising the Infinite and Absolute *as* infinite and *as* absolute, and the words Infinite and Absolute have no real meaning, unless we understand by them that which is infinite or absolute in some given attribute. But when he goes on to say that two things may, without difficulty, be proved, viz., 'that the ultimate reality is an Absolute Spirit whose existence is presupposed in all finite existence, whose thought is the one condition of all finite thoughts; and conversely, that it is only in communion with this Absolute Spirit or Intelligence that the finite spirit can realise itself,' it seems to us that he oversteps the mark. It is not enough to show that 'thought is the *prius* of all things,' unless it be further shown that the 'thought of which we thus speak is not individual or finite thought, but that the mind is impelled onwards by its own inward dialectic until it finds its goal in a thought which is *universal and absolute*.' Dr. Caird says that the Infinite of religion cannot be a self-identical Being, but is the 'organic whole which is the unity of the Infinite and Finite;' that Nature, Man, and God are not discordant and irreconcilable ideas, but ideas which belong to one organic whole or system of knowledge; and that the true solution of the great problem of religion is found by apprehending the Finite Mind and the Infinite Mind as the moments or members of an organic whole, in which both exist at once in their distinction and their unity. Hence he argues that the idea of God as Mind or Thought must be infinite or absolute, because thought postulates a thought or self-consciousness which is the absolute element or atmosphere in which it lives and breathes: 'all other categories than that of Thought or Self-consciousness are still categories of the finite . . . and it is only when we think of Him as Absolute Spirit or Self-consciousness that we attain to an idea of His nature which, while it gives to the finite the reality of an object ever distinguishable from, never lost in the subject, yet refuses to it any independence or individuality which cannot be brought back to a higher unity.' Now it will be observed that when the *True Infinite* is defined as the organic unity of the Infinite and Finite, the term 'infinite' is used in two different senses in the same definition. Again, there is nothing in the nature of thought or self-consciousness to separate it from all other

categories: thought is a finite category, so is self-consciousness. Again, when it is said that all finite thought or self-consciousness implies a universal Self-consciousness, whose objective reality is carried with itself, there is a begging of the question; for though, as Bishop Berkeley showed, the existence of the world implies that there is a mind independent of our minds which are ever passing and never continue in one stay, yet that this is no proof that the Mind on which the world depends is itself Absolute and Infinite in any philosophical sense of those words. Dr. Caird, indeed, asserts that in the very notion of a spiritual self-conscious being there is already 'involved what may be called a virtual or potential 'infinitude,' and that as contrasted with Nature it is the prerogative of mind to be in virtual possession of a kind of infinitude. Now although it be the characteristic of a spiritual intelligent being that it cannot be shut up in its own individuality but shares in the life of the world around, and also that the Perfect Unity of the ideal and the actual is only a promised possession, not an acquired inheritance; yet it by no means follows that in the fact that we can feel and know it to *be* our ideal inheritance, there is to us a 'revelation of the 'Infinite and of our essential relation to it;' or that in the distinction between our actual selves and our ideal aspiration there is presupposed 'an identity that is beyond the distinction.' The consciousness of all imperfection here may indeed *suggest* that there is a Perfect Being elsewhere, but it assuredly does not prove it.

In the converse proposition Dr. Caird, following the lead of Hegel, contends that our individual self-consciousness is a moment of the self-consciousness of the Infinite, and that it is by uniting ourselves with the Absolute Thought or Self-Consciousness that we realise ourselves as rational and spiritual beings:—

'In one word, to live no more my own life, but let my consciousness become possessed and suffused by the Infinite and Eternal life of spirit. Yet it is just in this renunciation of self that I truly gain myself, or realise the highest possibilities of my nature. . . . For whilst in one sense we give up self to live the universal and absolute life of reason, yet that to which we thus surrender ourselves is in reality our truer self. . . . It is the fulfilment and freedom of every spiritual being to become the organ of Infinite and Absolute reason. When we attain the ideal perfection of our nature, the self that is foreign to it is foreign to us too; it has become lost and absorbed in that deeper, higher self with which our whole life and being is identified' (p. 250).

'The knowledge and love of God is the giving up of all thoughts and feelings that belong to me as a mere individual self, and the identi-

fication of my thought and being with that which is above me, yet in me—the Universal or Absolute Self, which is not mine or yours, but in which all intelligent beings alike find the realisation and the perfection of their nature' (p. 257).

This position has all the attractive power which Pantheism possesses for both religious and speculative minds; and it is not surprising to find that the followers of Hegel in Germany have shown a strong tendency to drift into a Pantheism which reduces God, Man, and Nature to a colourless identity. Dr. Caird foresees the danger, and he therefore claims for his position that it does not involve the identification of the finite spirit with the Infinite; but that, on the contrary, in it the individuality of each human spirit reaches its intensest specification: 'it gives us a principle in the light of which we can see that God is all in all, without denying reality to the finite world and to every individual human spirit.'* Nevertheless, it is difficult to see how the theory that all consciousness is the phenomenal manifestation of the Infinite and Absolute Self-consciousness can, when rigorously pressed, help destroying the individuality of the finite and absorbing it into the Infinite, for then, as he admits, our rational 'knowledge of God is, in one point of view, God's knowledge of Himself;' in other words, the Absolute is only self-conscious in man, or in some finite intelligence, which is needed to bring the Absolute to self-consciousness; and in this point of view the philosophy of religion is described as 'simply a conscious development of the process by which the finite spirit loses its finitude.'

It is most interesting to note the similarity of Dr. Caird's final position with that arrived at by the ancient *Rishis* of India, a thousand years before our era. Professor Max Müller, in his Introduction to the edition of the '*Upanishads*' recently published at Oxford, says that the object of the *Upanishads* is to recognise the self in man as a

* In the '*Scotch Sermons*,' recently published, he describes this position as a '*Christian Pantheism*,' p. 24. 'Whether Hegel should be regarded as theist, pantheist, or atheist,' says Prof. Flint, 'is a point on which not only his foes but his disciples are divided, so that you have Hegelians of every shade of religious opinion, each man believing himself faithful to the system of his master.' Mr. Hunt, in his '*Essay on Pantheism*,' says that while 'Hegel dreads nothing so much as pantheism,' he yet concludes his *Encyclopædia* with some verses from a Persian poet which express, as well as poetry can express, the great idea of his Philosophy, and these verses are 'perhaps the most accurate expression of what is called Pantheism which we have yet met.'

'phase or phenomenal modification only of the Highest Self; that Highest Self which was to them the last point that could be reached by philosophical speculation; it was to them what in other systems of philosophy has been called by various names, $\tau\acute{o} \delta\epsilon\upsilon$, the Divine, the Absolute. The highest aim of all thought and study with the Brahman of the Upanishads was to recognise his own self as a mere limited reflection of the Highest Self, to know his own self in the Highest Self, and through that knowledge to return to it, and regain his identity with it. . . . That Highest Self, which had become to the ancient Brahmins the goal of all their mental efforts, was looked upon at the same time as the starting-point of all phenomenal existence, the root of the world, the only thing that could truly be said to be, to be real and true.'

Again :

'The key-note of the old Upanishads is "Know thy Self," but with a much deeper meaning than that of the $\Gamma\omega\theta\iota \sigma\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ of the Delphic oracle. The "Know thy Self" of the Upanishads means, know thy true Self, that it underlies thine ego, and find it and know it in the highest, the eternal Self, the One without a second, which underlies the world. . . . And yet they did not believe in the annihilation of their own self, annihilation was certainly not the last and highest goal to which the philosophy or the religion of the Indian dwellers in the forest looked forward—the true self was to remain.'

This parallelism of thought supplies one of the many instances in which the philosophical conclusions of the present day coincide with those of pre-Christian times, and it serves to enforce the importance of an exhaustive study of the data of history, on which alone a true philosophy of religion can be constructed. The philosophy of Hegel is essentially historical, and is in perfect accord with the warning of Professor Max Müller, that 'the problems which chiefly occupy theoretic theology ought not to be taken up till all the evidence that can possibly be gained from a comparative study of the religions of the world has been fully collected, classified, and analysed.'

III. The study of the comparative history of religion throws fresh light upon the problem of religion itself. It is a study which has been neglected alike by theologians and philosophers, who have confined their attention almost exclusively to theoretic theo-

* The Upanishads, p. xxx., Oxford, 1879; Hibbert Lectures, pp. 317, 361. Cf. the interesting dialogue between Uddālaka and his son Svetaketu, in which man's true relation to the Highest Self is explained, in the *Khândogya-upanishad*, vi. Professor Knight falls into the ancient phraseology when he says that God is the 'Substantial Self' 'that underlies the surface evanescent self.' 'Scotch Sermons,' p. 135.

† Science of Religion, p. 22.

logy. This neglect has arisen, not from any doubt as to the importance of the subject, but from the very partial knowledge which could be obtained before the discoveries of recent years supplied the key to unlock the vast storehouses of religious experience contained in the Sacred Books of Mankind. The discovery of a new set of sacred books resembles the discovery of the key to a lost language—it opens up an endless vista into an unknown country. The papyri of Egypt with the sculptures and frescoes of her tombs and temples reveal the ancient religion as told not by the Hebrew slaves, but by her own priests and literati; the cuneiform inscriptions on the tablets and cylinders found in the libraries of Nineveh disclose a religion anterior to the migration of the Abrahamic tribes from Mesopotamia; Sanskrit has opened the sacred books of India to European scholars, and offered ‘for a study of religion in general, and especially for the origin and growth of religion, the same peculiar and unexpected advantages which the language of India has offered for the origin and growth of human speech;’* the romantic enthusiasm of Anquetil Duperron recovered the fragments of the Zend Avesta, and disclosed glimpses of the purity and lofty thought of a religion which, although it is now professed by a mere handful of Parsees, bade fair at one time to become the religion of the civilised world; and the Buddhist books in Pāli, in Sanskrit, in Thibetan, and in Chinese, unfold a code of ethics which can hardly be ranked lower than that of Christianity, and portray a life which is the ‘realised ideal of all that Buddha taught.’† These ancient documents unveil the soul of the people; they are the most perfect expression of their individuality, a ‘moral portrait drawn by their own hand,’‡ and a record not of the history of kings and conquests but of the movements of spiritual thought in the religious experience of mankind.§

* Max Müller’s ‘Hibbert Lectures,’ p. 131.

† ‘Le Bouddha et sa Religion,’ par B. St. Hilaire, Introd. v.

‡ ‘Études d’Histoire Religieuse,’ par E. Renan, p. 3.

§ It is an interesting problem to examine why the precious grains of truth contained in sacred books are often hidden under heaps of rubbish, and thoughts which are simple and fragrant as with the dew of the morning are found growing in the same soil with thoughts which are not only silly, but even repellent and hideous:—

‘A stagnant fen,
Grown rank with rushes and with reeds,
Where a white lily, now and then
Blooms in the midst of noxious weeds.’—Boccaccio.

The subject is discussed in the Preface to ‘Sacred Books of the East,’ pp. x., xxxviii.

Now it is the function of a philosophy of religion not merely to trace the movements of spiritual thought, and to classify and generalise the experiences enshrined in the sacred books of mankind, but also to formulate the *principle* which shall enable us to make a comparison that is scientific and philosophical. Philosophy, as the interpreter of facts, with a view to their complete unification, aims at comprehending the true significance of the religious facts which history has accumulated, so as to grasp the principle which brings them into proportion and unity. Amid the resemblances and diversities which appear on the surface of the different religions,—resemblances which apparently unite religions essentially different, differences which apparently separate religions closely united—it is the work of philosophy to seek for the clue to their spiritual meaning, for the principle of thought, of order, and of law, which underlies these resemblances and diversities, and binds them together in organic unity—in one word, for that unification which is characteristic of all developing thought. This principle of unification is found in the essential idea of religion itself, which, though it cannot exist apart from the particular religions, and becomes known only as expressed and realised in them, is yet presupposed in every religious experience, just as the force of electricity underlies and is presupposed in the thunder-storm which is its manifestation. This fundamental idea or principle of religion, while it is ever changing its manifestations in the outward form of positive religions, in all future times no less than in all past times, yet itself remains constant and unchangeable throughout all time. In it therefore we find the clue to the significance of the positive religions, and the standard which determines their relative place and their value in the ascending scale which marks the evolution of the religious consciousness of mankind.

And here Dr. Caird throws out a suggestion which can only be elucidated by a more detailed analysis of the various positive religions than is possible in an Introduction :—

‘Moreover, it is in the light of this fundamental idea of all religion, if at all, that we shall be able to perceive whether the various religions of the world, and the successive stages in the history of individual religions, rise out of each other not arbitrarily or in obedience to merely external conditions, but by a natural transition, as the stages of one organic process’* (p. 326).

* Hegel viewed the phases of religion as so many stages in the development of the consciousness of the unity of the human spirit with the Divine or Absolute. The chief stages he divides into three, which

That the successive stages in the history of individual religions rise out of each other by a natural transition is certainly true. In the historical religions there is no great difficulty in tracing the progress of their growth and of their decay. In India,* for instance, the Hindoo mind unfolds the idea of God through well-defined stages of the evolutionary process from the words of simple faith contained in the earlier Vedic hymns until it reaches its highest expression in the philosophy of the Upanishads; in Egypt† the decline of the idea of God is no less marked as we trace it from the sublime conception of the more ancient hymns to the lowest depths of the animal worship of later times; in Hebrew thought we see its gradual evolution from the inadequate idea of a Being who converses with Adam in the garden of Eden, until it reaches its highest spiritual conception at the well of Sychar: 'God is a Spirit.' Although the evolution of the consciousness of the Infinite among the Aryan, the Egyptian, and the Semitic races is very different, each religion having its own peculiar growth, each 'following its own path through the wilderness,' each being characterised by its own genius—the spirit which is the living result of all the stages through which the progressive movements of thought have passed within its religious experience,—yet all have sprung from the same seed, and in all the growth has proceeded not by arbitrary conditions, but in the natural transition of an organic development.

We do not, however, possess sufficient data to establish the further suggestion, that the various religions of the world '*rise out of each other by a natural transition.*' We see, indeed,

he designates as the religions of nature, of the individual spirit, and of the Absolute Spirit. In the first God is felt as natural being or natural power. In the second the Divine is viewed as subject, and has three representative forms: Judaism the religion of sublimity, Greek Polytheism the religion of beauty, and Roman Polytheism the religion of the practical understanding. The Absolute Spirit, after passing through these forms, comes to know itself as such; and in this self-knowledge God is reconciled with the world and man, and apprehended as essentially Triune; this absolute religion is Christianity, which differs from Absolute Philosophy only in form or expression, being the same in substance. (Flint's 'Phil. of Hist.' p. 510.)

* Hibbert Lectures (1878), sections on 'Evolution in Vedic Religion' (p. 339) and on 'Growth of Religion in India' (p. 131).

† M. E. de Rougé, 'Annales de la Philosophie Chrétienne,' tome xx. p. 327. No trace of the earlier growth of the Egyptian religion has yet been discovered—it springs, like Athené from the brain of Zeus, fully armed.

that the religions of Zoroaster and of Buddha were reactions from the religion of the Veda, that Confucius and Laou-tsze based their teaching on the works of 'the ancients,' that Christianity was cradled in Judaism, and that Judaism itself may have been influenced, although the traces are but slight, by the religions of Egypt* and of Persia;† but, on the other hand, one of the greatest historical religions, the Egyptian, is the earliest of which we have any record; and the latest, Islâm, is certainly not the crown and glory of the religious consciousness of mankind; while the striking similarity of the position to which the Hegelian method has led Dr. Caird himself to that of the ancient Hindus, is not without significance in its bearing on the question. All that we are justified in asserting on our present data, as it seems to us, is that in the never-ending quest after the Infinite, and the struggle of thought with the mystery of the universe which is ever pressing for solution, there is an organic evolution, in which the spiritual principle advances towards higher developments of the religious life—each stage of the growth being so related that the earliest religious phenomena contain the promise and potentiality of the religious future of the world. Further data may be forthcoming hereafter which shall establish the historical connexion of the religions of the world; but the evidence at present available only shows that no religion can be regarded as isolated and separate from the others, that all are bound together in the unity of thought as different forms in which the universal idea of religion has expressed itself by the all-dominating activity of an ideal and spiritual development, and that in every religious anomaly we must turn to the study of development for its solution.

But if it be a function of philosophy to determine the origin and development of religion, it is also its function to formulate its passage towards dissolution and decay. There is a differential process always going on towards either growth or dissolution. Religions are growing or decaying, integrating or disintegrating. During the earlier part of the cycle of changes, the integration predominates; the centre of the cycle is characterised not by equilibrium between the integrating and disintegrating processes, but by alternate excesses of them; and the cycle closes with a period in which the disintegration, beginning to predominate, eventually puts a stop to integration and undoes what integration had already done.‡ It has been

* Renouf's 'Hibbert Lectures,' p. 244.

† Kuenen's 'Religion of Israel,' cap. ix.

‡ H. Spencer's 'First Principles,' p. 284.

pointed out by Baur, that the cycle of decay and dissolution had already set in among the old Pagan religions, and that they were crumbling to ruins before Christianity appeared to complete the process. The decay, however, was only in the forms and institutions from which the spirit which used to find in them the best expression of its religious feelings had departed, because its expansion had become too great to be any longer confined within the ancient limits. The new wine bursts the bottles; 'the old system decays because the new truth which is to succeed is already there; the old would not decay if the new had not arrived, be it but in germ, and been long labouring to undermine and eat away the existing structure. . . . The heaven is working deep out of sight, and the unresting vital process cannot be stayed, but goes evenly and regularly forward in its successive stages, until it has produced a new creation.'* Dr. Caird adopts this theory of Baur, and says, that 'the decay of the old religions was not a mere process of negation, but one wrought by the hidden implicit energy of the higher truth that was yet to be.' This theory may hold true in some cases,† as when Brahmanism decays during the thousand years of the Buddhist reformation, and then again wins its empire over its rival which is driven forth from the land of its birth to be welcomed by the stranger, the Turanian race; or when Judaism decays, and in its decay gives birth to Christianity, which it never acknowledges as its own, but leaves to be adopted by the stranger, the Aryan race, and to become the religion of European civilisation and progress. But it does not account for the decay of the religion of Egypt, which we may trace in its decline from the zenith of its spiritual life to its fall in the gross animal worship of later times; which nevertheless was not wrought by the 'implicit energy of a higher truth,' for the decay of the religion went hand in hand with the decay of the nation itself.

In the presence of this law of evolution the question arises, is there anything in the idea of organic development which derogates from the claim of Christianity to be a religion of divine and supernatural origin? Dr. Caird considers that there is not, and he faces the question with characteristic courage:—

'Christianity implies a new spiritual movement, an advance or elevation of the human spirit, which, though it does not obliterate, transcends all the results of its past history. . . . In organic development the

* Baur's 'Church History,' p. 10. Eng. Ed.

† Archbishop Trench has some excellent remarks on the Quickening of the Old Faiths, in his 'Lectures on Plutarch.'

new, though presupposing the old, involves the introduction of a wholly original element not given in the old. . . . In the light of this idea we can perceive these imperfect notions yielding up, under the transforming influence of Christianity, whatever element of truth lay hid in them, whilst that which was arbitrary and false falls away and dies' (p. 355).*

Christianity, therefore, cannot be regarded as an isolated phenomenon severed from all connexion with the religious thought and culture of pre-Christian times, but must be viewed as the unfolding of the blossom which has assimilated to itself all that was best and noblest in the religious thought of the ages. When Christianity entered the stream of the world's history, it bore upon its waters truths which awoke such a response in the hearts and minds of men as showed that it was in essential relation to the spiritual and moral consciousness of mankind, which had been developed through the discipline of the earlier religions. Had not man's moral consciousness been already developed, Christianity could not have gained a hearing in the world in its character of an essentially moral religion. Christianity laid hold of the spirit of man with irresistible force, because the whole moral and religious development not merely of the isolated and insignificant Jewish nation, but of all the races and nations of the ancient world, constituted a preparation for it: 'The glory of Christianity lies,' says Archbishop Trench, 'not in its having relation to nothing which went before itself, but rather in its having relation to *everything*; in its being the middle point to which all lines, some consciously 'more unconsciously, were tending, and in which all centred at 'the last.' †

This preparation will hardly be found in the not very elevated idea of Providence which represents it as 'busy'ing 'itself in providing facilities of travel, and of rapid and safe 'intercommunication, for the messengers of the Gospel,' but in the intellectual movement of men's minds and in the lofty aspirations of their hearts.‡

* Mr. Hunt says that the 'attempt of Strauss to connect his doctrine with Hegel's was unwarranted—the whole spirit and character of 'Strauss' "Life of Jesus" is contrary to Hegelianism. Hegel was *constructive*.' (Essay on Pantheism, p. 286, *n*.)

† Hulsean Lectures, p. 4. These lectures are illustrated entirely by the religions of Greece and Rome, which have not left any sacred books; they give no heed to the Eastern religions, which have in them, as M. Renan observes, 'quelque chose de plus profond que les cultes 'grecs et latins—ils parlaient davantage au sentiment religieux' (Conf. d'Ang. p. 42).

‡ The view which the Christian fathers took of the relation of

A real preparation for Christianity is seen in those spiritual aspirations of the soul which have been happily called 'unconscious prophecies of heathendom,' the implicit expectations of the life and teaching of Christ:—'Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, he saw it and was glad.' We recognise it when the Egyptians, two thousand years before the Christian era, spoke of God as the 'One, Sole, and Only,' and announced that the principle of the final judgment would be in accordance with the formula, 'I fed the hungry, I gave drink to the thirsty, I clothed the naked, I sheltered the out-cast, I was a father to the fatherless; '*—when the Hindu prayed in the land of the Seven Rivers to the 'Father, who is 'most fatherly of fathers'—when Zoroaster proclaimed God to be the Father of righteousness and truth, and the Friend of all men who do right and are true—when Buddha, being touched with pity for the sorrows of all living creatures, was moved by his exceeding great love to leave his wife and home to preach the salvation of the world by the Law of Self-sacrificing Love—when Confucius spoke that one word, which we translate by many: 'Do not to others what you would not others should do to you,' and taught that 'benevolence is the love of all men'—when Socrates bade Alcibiades wait for some one who should teach him how to

Greek thought to Christianity applies with equal force to the other religions. Clemens Alexandrinus says that the Greek Philosophy was 'the gift of God, and as the pedagogue led the child to school (ἐπαγωγὴ) so it led the Greeks, just as the Law the Hebrews, towards 'Christ,' and that these philosophies were steps leading from the lower to the higher, and a preparatory discipline of the human consciousness in the providence of God. (Strom. i. 28. Cf. Gal. iii. 24: ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν. Strom. vi. 8, 17.) The Greek philosophy with its feeling of the profound significance of the human consciousness was the most important antecedent of Christianity in the historic development.

* M. de Rougé says of the Egyptian religion: 'L'unité d'un être suprême existant par lui-même, son éternité, sa toute-puissance et la génération éternelle en Dieu; la création du monde et de tous les êtres vivants attribuée à ce Dieu suprême: l'immortalité de l'âme complétée par le dogme des peines et des récompenses: tel est le fond sublime et persistant qui, malgré toutes les déviations et toutes les broderies mythologiques, doit assurer aux croyances des anciens Egyptiens un rang très-honorable parmi les religions de l'antiquité.'—Rev. Arch., Feb. 1860. 'Etudes sur le Rituel Funéraire des Anciens Egyptiens,' p. 73. 'Saï an Sinsin,' ed. Brugsch, § 14. Contrast the Egyptian pride, 'I fed the hungry,' with the Christian humility, 'Lord, when saw we thee an hungered and fed thee?'

pray, and remove the ignorance of his mind,* when on the day of his death he bade his friends search through all lands for the great teacher who should remove the fear of death from their minds,† or when he drew the portrait of the perfect man‡ which in its minute details foreshadows the likeness of the Son of Man four hundred years before the Cross of Calvary.§ It would be easy to multiply these longing desires of the ancient world, this consciousness of some want acutely felt, this hunger and thirst after righteousness, this journeying of the nations ‘seeking the Lord, if haply they might feel after ‘him and find him.’ The instances we have given must, however, suffice as manifestations of the deep movement of religious thought which pervaded the world, and prepared the nations for higher truth and wider knowledge.

As an instance of the intellectual movement which prepared the way for Christianity, we will take the universalism to which the history of the world had been tending for centuries before. Plutarch tells us that Alexander the Great thought that God, whom he considered to be the ‘Father of all men and ‘in an especial manner of the best men,’ had sent him to unite the nations in a universal body, so that all men should regard the world as their common country, the good as fellow-citizens and brothers, the bad as foreigners and enemies. Zeno raised this idea of Alexander to a nobler region when he conceived a Universal Republic, the grand republic of intelligences, with God for Master, and his eternal thought for conduct and law. The broad basis of Roman civilisation and law com-

* ‘When shall that time come?’ asks the statesman, ‘and who shall ‘be my teacher?’ ‘It is even one who careth for thee,’ replied the philosopher, . . . ‘and he shall remove the mist which now envelopes ‘your mind, that you may discern what is good and what is evil.’ Alcibiades, ii. 150. Cf. 1 Pet. v. 7, ‘Cast all your care upon Him, ‘for He careth for you.’

† ‘Greece is a wide place, and there are many foreign nations also, ‘and in search of this teacher many regions must be explored, and ‘neither money nor trouble spared in the search.’—Phædo, 60, 61.

‡ ‘Though doing no wrong he will have the greatest reputation for ‘wrong-doing’—‘he will go forward immovable even to death, appearing to be unjust throughout his life, yet being just’—‘he will be ‘scourged’—‘last of all, after suffering every kind of evil, he will be crucified’ (*ἀνασχινδυνεύθησεται*). Plato, Resp. ii. pp. 361, 362. Clement of Alexandria, quoting the passage, describes Plato as ‘all but ‘foretelling the dispensation of salvation’ (*μονονουχὶ προφητεύων τὴν σωτήριον οἰκονομίαν*).—Strom. v. 14.

§ Socrates, the ‘religious missionary doing the work of a philosopher,’ as Grote describes him, when he ‘struck the fire out of

pleted this political and mental unity. And thus it became a marked feature of the age in which Christianity appeared that its spiritual consciousness had been so far enlarged that it over-passed the exclusiveness and distinctions which separated men from each other, and laid hold of the universal elements in an all-embracing unity. But this universalism which knows no distinction of man and man is a characteristic of Christianity, and St. Paul does but repeat, while giving deeper significance to, the thought of Alexander when he says: 'Ye are fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God;' and he uses as a Christian formula, an expression which he may have borrowed from Menander, 'Whoever is by his nature good, is of noble race, be he Ethiopian or Scythian. Was not Anacharsis only a Scythian?'* Thus the characteristic of the age and of the religion were alike universal; and it is in this universal tendency common to both that we find the true point of contact between Christianity and the Roman Empire.

When Christianity appeared bearing the truths which were the real response to the spiritual cry of the world for light, it came not as a philosophical theory but as a Life. Christianity would have had no place in the world's history had it not been for the person of its Founder, that mighty personality which drew all men unto it by its living relation to the thought of its own and of all time: 'Æterna sapientia sese in omnibus rebus, maximè in humanâ mente, omnium maximè in Christo Jesu manifestavit.'† The ideal of supreme excellence which had stirred the bosom of humanity for ages, now shone forth in actual life, clothed itself in flesh and blood, became the world's ideal realised in fact. Christianity gave the world what the world needed—not a body of abstract principles of morality, for that it already possessed, but an ideal of moral beauty which, passing into its spiritual consciousness, became henceforth the absolute standard of perfection, the ideal type of the whole human race, the representative

'other minds which set light to original thought, permanently enlarging the horizon, improving the method, and multiplying the ascending minds of the speculative world,' exercised an influence over the subsequent history of European speculation which makes him one of the most important forces in the religious history of mankind.

* Quoted by Denis, *Histoire des Théories et des Idées Morales dans l'Antiquité*, tome i. pp. 369 sq., who suggests that the expression may have become proverbial, and found its way into St. Paul's Ep. to Col. iii. 11.

† Spinoza, *Epist. xxi.*, vol. iii. 195.

man. The Son of Man was the title that Christ chose for Himself, and it expresses that universality of character which is elevated above all peculiarities of time and place, so that no nation and no age can claim Him as exclusively its own, but every age and every nation feel that He is for them the Perfect Man. The consciousness of Jesus became the general consciousness of mankind, and the earlier Christians lived in the unspeakable joy of implicit faith in His Life. But the age was too speculative and philosophic for men to rest content in this feeling towards the Life alone; the questionings of the understanding soon disturbed the intensive serenity of simple faith, the horizon gradually changed, and Christianity was required to show its connexion with the previous intellectual possessions of mankind, and to formulate the essential relations of its parts as members of an organic whole. To answer the great questions of the age, the Christian consciousness was driven to make clear and explicit what it deemed intrinsic to itself, and to formulate in the definite conceptions and expressions of the Creed the doctrine of the Person of Christ, round which their whole spiritual consciousness revolved.

Each of the historical religions, reflecting the spirit of its age, exists apart in its own majesty and genius, yet all are bound together as members of one organic whole, and all point to the higher development of the religious idea expressed in Christianity. And Christianity in taking the place of the old religions proved its relation to them, not merely by supplying the moral and spiritual wants of human nature which were intensely felt, but in adopting and assimilating into its own life and thought all that was good and true in them, and by gathering to a focus the various tendencies which had been converging from different points, and giving them their fullest expression. But the law of evolution cannot be arrested at this point; it leads us to the conclusion of Lessing that as the New Testament afforded, and still affords, the 'second and 'better Primer for the race of man,' so there will be a 'new 'eternal Gospel which is promised us in the primer of the New 'Testament itself!''*

When we regard the religions of the world as members of an organic unity, we see that the universal or essential element in religion is not to be reached by any rule such as that of St. Vincent: '*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.*' To measure the content of belief by this canon would reduce

the residuum to those attenuated elements which are held in common by fetishism and Christianity. For, as Dr. Caird justly remarks, it is not that which is common to barbarism and civilisation which is most truly human, but that in which civilisation differs from barbarism. There is not a single idea in Christianity which remains what it was in the pre-existent religions, for every idea has been transfigured and absorbed into its more perfect life. As the element common to all the stages of human life is reached by grasping the idea which gives to their successive forms the character of one organic whole, so, in order to reach that which is really universal in religion,

‘we must go beyond the mere historical forms, and see beneath them the idea which is ever advancing to its fuller realisation, which at each successive stage of its progress loses nothing but leaves nothing unchanged, and fulfils the past only by transmuting the past. The perfect or absolute form of the idea, so far from giving us that which is common to all other forms, will thus retain in it unchanged not a single element which belonged to them. While it explains the latent significance of all that was true in the imperfect religions, it will transcend, and by transcending annul and destroy them.’ (pp. 82–85.)

It is this universal element in religion which seems to have been in the mind of St. Augustine, when he wrote these most remarkable words: ‘The essence of that which is now called the Christian religion existed in the ancient world. Never, indeed, was it lacking since the human race began till the day when Christ came in the flesh. Henceforth true religion, which already existed, took the name of Christianity.’* How this implicit revelation became explicit is one of the great problems of the Philosophy of Religion.

We have touched on some of the chief topics discussed by Dr. Caird in his ‘Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion,’ which we hope may prove to be in very deed the introduction to a larger work in which they will be treated in more detailed analysis. As it now stands, however, it will supply many thoughtful men, pressed by the arguments of those who are opposed to everything worthy of the name of religion, with a ‘reason for the hope that is in them.’ Even those who do not agree with the Hegelian solution of the problem of religion, will welcome a book rich in the results of speculative study,

* ‘Res ipsa, quæ nunc religio Christiana nuncupatur, erat apud antiquos; nec defuit ab initio generis humani, quousque Christus veniret in carnem; unde vera religio, quæ jam erat, cœpit appellari ‘Christiana.’—Retr. i. 13.’

broad in its intellectual grasp, and happy in its original suggestiveness. To all it will show that there are strong and weighty reasons, arising out of the very nature of man as a spiritual and intelligent being, which impel him to the belief in a God who is not the Unknowable, but is One who reveals Himself in thought and to thought; and that our feelings of awe and veneration are more fitly offered to a Being in whom are hid 'all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge,' than to one who is not only the Unknown but also the Unknowable, and therefore, for aught we can tell, the Unworthy. The belief in God as a being who, while He fills our capacity for knowledge, still leaves us with the feeling that there is in Him an infinitude of beauty and truth which He will impart to those who search for the deep things of God, must always be an ennobling thought, and is one which will impart a never-ending impulse to penetrate into the illimitable realm of truth, and realise the fact that to know God is for the spirit of man eternal life. Then the sphere of religion becomes, if we may avail ourselves of the lofty description of Hegel himself,

'a region in which the spirit rids itself of its finiteness, and relates itself to that which is unlimited and infinite—where its attitude is no longer that of dependence but of freedom, and where the individual has no longer to do with himself, his interests, his vanity, but only with absolute truth. All anxiety and doubt, all petty cares and troubles, all narrow and selfish interests, are left behind on the sand-bank of time. In this pure region we penetrate beyond the outward deceitful shows and semblances of the world, and behold all things revealed to us, transfigured in the pure light of truth and softened in its halo of eternal rest and peace.' *

ART. VI.—1. *L'Italie Actuelle*. Lettres à un Ami, par ÉMILE DE LAVELEYE. Paris and London: 1880.

2. *I Partiti Politici alle Elezioni Generali dell' anno 1880, appunti di Statistica elettorale*. Con Carta grafica. Estratto dall' Archivio di Statistica, anno v. Roma e Torino: 1880.

THE name of M. de Laveleye is not new to European literature or to our own readers. Ranging in the subjects of his study from the poetry of the Nibelungen and the Eddas to the abstruse questions of the nature and causes of the monetary changes of the last half-century, his genius has dwelt by preference in the regions of rural economy, of popular instruction, and of the problems of politics, regarded as a branch

* Philosophie der Religion, i. 5.

of moral philosophy. We have lately had to combat some of his views on primitive property in land, which he held to be essentially inapplicable to modern society; but we now rejoice to find ourselves in cordial agreement with him. Towards the close of the year 1878 M. de Laveleye repaired to Italy, not, as he tells us, in order to revisit the scenery and the works of art with which he was already acquainted, but to study on the spot the working of the institutions newly introduced into the peninsula. He wished to converse with the leaders of thought in Italy. But he cannot lay aside the good taste of the cultivated student of art, and he wields a facile pen, which illustrates the pages of his journal with piquant and kindly word pictures, both of men and of scenes.

The letters, now issued in a volume, were originally published in the '*Revue de Belgique*.' The fugitive character impressed on them by their form is to some extent counteracted by the novelty of some of the observations and the frequent truth of not a few of the reflections.

It is obvious that in attempting to skim the cream of a series of letters we cannot accompany the author in his tour, or jot down day by day, from his lips, the impressions that he received. The route from Brussels to Naples is too well known to allow of such a mode of review. On the other hand, the work is too slight to allow of being used as the basis of a systematic article on those economic and social questions which the author had chiefly at heart. The only method, therefore, by which we can hope at once to interest the reader and to do justice to the writer, is to select one or two of the chief points which his travels were intended to elucidate; to throw together those remarks on such points which are scattered in the letters; and to reproduce some of those pen-and-ink vignettes which add to the brilliancy of the pages.

Here, for example, is a sketch taken in the passage of the Alps:—

'Traversed the Brenner in a tempest of snow. The locomotive painfully toiled up the steep incline, perpendicularly surmounting the torrent which brawled at the foot of the precipice. The side of the mountain is completely covered with stalactites, and draped with silver curtains formed by the frozen waters. The effect is that of fairyland. Through the falling snowflakes loom lofty summits, like gigantic phantoms of the gods of the mythology of the North, guarding the pass. It seems as though they were about to annihilate us by the avalanches suspended by their sides. On the southern slope the storm ceased, and we arrived at Verona in a splendid night, illumined by a cloudless moon.'

The chief motive of the journey is indicated by the author in a few lines at the commencement of the first chapter. In Europe there exist, he says, two centres of high intellectual culture—the Latin and the German. They differ widely, but from their union spring admirable fruits. Such, for example, was the genius of Goethe, profoundly German in its inspiration, but Græco-Latin in its form. The great works of the German economists are but little known out of Germany. The Italian economists, however, have made them the subject of profound study; and, adding to the Teutonic philosophy the clearness of view and vivacity of expression proper to the Latin spirit, have produced very instructive and very useful books. M. de Laveleye desired to make the acquaintance of the authors of these books.

Two practical problems relative to education have received in Italy an amount of illustration that merits attention. These are, the question of religious teaching as a portion of primary instruction, and the mode of recruiting the body of professors in the universities. These are indicated, at starting, as the main objects of the investigation of the tourist. But the urgent questions of the distress of the working classes, of the relation of the peasants to the rich, and of the best method of assuring agricultural progress, prove to be those on which, in perusing the letters, the attention of the reader will be most closely rivetted, and on which indeed the most light has been thrown by the writer. Above all, the alarm excited in the minds of the ablest statesmen by the apparent withering up of the religious principle throughout Italy is echoed again and again in the letters. Here is one passage, out of many, on this subject:—

‘On arriving on the other side of the Alps I found every one disquieted, tormented with vague fears, regarding the future as involved in gloom. I was much struck by this; nothing had prepared me to expect it. “What disquiets me for my country,” said M. Politeo (a Professor of Philosophy at Venice and at Padua), “is the fact of the gradual disappearance of the religious sentiment in all classes of society, which has left a complete void. In Belgium and in Germany, faith yet subsists among a large portion of the population. It is perhaps a cause of embarrassment in political struggles, but it is a guarantee of morality and of stability. England has been the first country in the world because it is there that religion has preserved the most influence. Thence that sentiment of duty, that horror of falsehood, that respect for right, which are so conspicuous among the English. In Italy, indifference is general. Among the tradesfolk, and even among the aristocracy, the religious idea is dead. Amongst the townspeople religion is regarded with hostility; in the rural districts it survives only

in certain habits which have no influence on the daily life. Even the clergy has no longer an ideal. I do not venture to say that it doubts, so little does it reflect on religious questions; but it has no enthusiasm for its faith. Fanaticism is, at all events, an evidence of force of mind and of the existence of spiritual life. Here you will not meet a single fanatic. The priest says his mass habitually; he occupies his mind with his own petty interests, and thinks little of securing the power of the Church or of the Pope. In the same way *la prètrophobie*, the hatred of what is clerical, so ardent on the other side of the Alps, hardly exists in Italy. No one dreams of striving against that which attacks no one and resists nothing. From this general absence of strong beliefs results an enfeebling of character, a reduction of the moral level, which renders everything possible. We may continue to live thus for a long time; but, on the other hand, by the action of a slow and invisible decomposition, we may witness a sudden catastrophe." (p. 52.)

At Venice M. de Laveleye conversed also with M. Fambri.

"M. Fambri is one of the best orators in the Parliament. He also sees things in gloom, though from a different point of view from M. Politeo. "Except in the South," said he, "the dangerous classes are not very numerous in Italy; but they are active, noisy, and audacious, while the Conservatives are inert, timid, and easily intimidated by menace. In case of trouble, a small minority can dominate and crush the majority. There is, it is true, the army, which is excellent. It is at present animated by a good spirit, but the demagogues seek to acquire influence in it. The non-commissioned officers are ill-paid, and enjoy a great amount of freedom. The *circoli Barsanti*, which are tolerated, form a direct excitation to revolt. If ever this bad spirit makes its way into the army, we shall be exposed to the most frightful consequences."

The 'Circoli Barsanti' are a kind of clubs, which are, in reality, republican and demagogic associations. They are named after a sergeant of the name of Barsanti, who was shot by order of a court martial, some six years ago, for participation in a riot at Pavia in which an officer was killed. It was alleged that Barsanti was unjustly condemned, and the agitators made use of his name to found a sort of propaganda in the army.

"What the deputy Fambri said to me has given much food for reflection. In our social condition, profoundly troubled as it is, the elements of disorder augment so rapidly that we have indeed need to count upon the army, to prevent an explosion. But what will happen if the army itself is invaded by subversive doctrines? In the southern countries that danger is more to be feared than in the north. Ideas spread more quickly. They pass from one to another by lively and impassioned speech. In countries where men drink beer, they exchange a word every two minutes, and it takes years to ripen an idea.

Here it is always the life of the forum; excitement is communicated like the electric spark.'

This division between the north and the south of Italy is remarkably illustrated by a map annexed to a small pamphlet on political parties in Italy, recently published at Rome, and bearing the name of Orazio Focardi. As a graphic illustration both of the bent and of the force of political opinion, this map is well deserving of being taken as a model. The various colleges, or electoral centres, are indicated by concentric circles, of which the colour indicates the party returning the representative, and the number shows the number of votes received per hundred of electors. The green circles, which indicate the returns of the deputies of the Right, are very few south of the line which extends from Viterbo to Ancona. They are most thickly spread on the shores of the rivers which run from the Alps to the Adriatic, and on the classic borders of the Arno. In the old kingdom of the Two Sicilies the brown circles, which represent the dissident Left, are most numerous and most concentric. The pink circles, indicating the ministerial party, also ranked as Left, are more evenly distributed over the peninsula.

At Bologna M. de Laveleye had long conversations with M. Minghetti, the former Prime Minister, then president of the Provincial Council of the Bolognese. Bologna is an important centre of the working-class movement. The view there taken is gloomy. The prefect of Bologna is described as gravely occupied with the social question. He spoke of the great sufferings of the people:—

'Their misery,' he said, 'is real, and the resignation to the state of affairs, formerly so general, has disappeared with the religious sentiment. It is astonishing and alarming to see with what rapidity the former has given place to an absolute incredulity, and often to a hatred against religion and its ministers. In Romagna, especially, this hostility is met in all classes. It is not so much that theoretic socialist doctrines are spread in Italy; it is misery that develops among the people, in the towns as well as in the country, a suppressed irritation and a violent hatred against the existing social order.'

Of Minghetti our author speaks in the highest terms. His recent work on the Relations between Political Economy and Law and Moral Philosophy is much misrepresented by the French translation. 'Is it not absurd,' said Minghetti, 'that we, who everywhere else—in Belgium, in France, or in England—would form the left centre or even the left, are here the extreme right? as if we were reactionaries.' He lamented the lame progress of representative government in Italy, which he

attributes to the absence of an organised opposition. With the exception of a small band of seventeen or eighteen republicans there are no serious differences between the deputies. The consequence is, that debate degenerates into personal squabbles for office. The abstention of the clerical party from political action appears to the Italian patriot to be a national misfortune :—

‘The misfortune of Catholic countries,’ remarks M. de Laveleye, ‘is, that when the clerical party intervenes in politics, it makes use of the religious sentiment for its weapon. It enforces its will by the pulpit, the confessional, the altar, the sacraments. On the other side, the Liberal journals wage a war without quarter against the priest. Between the two currents of opinion the religious sentiment is profoundly injured. In Italy, where faith is rapidly vanishing, the clergy takes no part in active politics, and it is scarcely at all attacked in the journals. If, as in Belgium, an ardent hostility against the religious idea should develop itself, the formidable problem will be pressing for solution, “Can a people exist without religion?”’

‘Yes,’ cried Madame Minghetti, ‘that is what I often ask with anguish. Around me, in the world, I see that faith daily becomes more rare, even among women. There is not often among them reasoned infidelity, absolute revolt; but doubt, chill, indifference. Is a belief in God about to vanish? Will the heaven become empty, and will there be there no longer a Supreme Being from whom to seek consolation in our hours of sadness and discouragement? Is everything about to be reduced to this earth, to those moments so often shadowed, saddened, made desperate? Do you not feel the chill of annihilation seize you?’

‘The political situation of Italy,’ according to M. de Laveleye, ‘is regulated by the cardinal fact that there is no line of distinct demarcation traced between political parties. In Belgium, the separation between Catholics and Liberals is absolute. In France, it is the same between Monarchists and Republicans. In Italy you pass, by invisible gradations, from the extreme left to the extreme right, nor is there a man who can state clearly what are the “great principles” which divide the two parties.’

M. de Laveleye attended with much interest the debates of the Italian Parliament. The luxurious appointments of the palace of the legislature struck him as affording a harsh contrast to the misery of the people. The press is treated as a fourth power, the whole of one side of the tribunes being reserved for the reporters. There is also a large tribune reserved for officers of the army; a species of encouragement for political sympathy the wisdom of which the Belgian statesman more than questions. For the general public the accommodation is small and access difficult. The fatal facility of speech which characterises the Italian race is hinted

by the polite phrase, *non sans longueurs*. The tolerance and patience of the Chamber are perfect. A ministry is overthrown with the utmost gentleness and calm. The absence of distinct party principle, while it is conducive to this agreeable smoothness of debate, appears to our author to be a veritable danger. As the parties were regarded in December 1879, the right, counting 110 members, followed Minghetti and Sella. The centre comprised only thirty voices, led by Cesar Correnti. The left is very numerous, and is divided into numerous sections. Cairoli leads 140 members; Nicotera, 60; Depretis, 90; and Crispi from 20 to 30. These are exclusive of some seventeen Republicans who follow Bertani. Again, local or provincial reasons may cause cross divisions of the Chamber. Peruzzi is above everything a Tuscan. Thus a Cabinet is never sure of a majority from day to day. 'The instability of ministers is the scourge of parliamentary government. 'There has been a much larger number of ministerial crises 'than there has been of years of the existence of the kingdom 'of Italy.' In France the tenth year of the Republic closed with the fall of the thirty-seventh Republican Cabinet.

We may add here one or two striking facts illustrative of the parliamentary system of Italy, taken from the previously cited pamphlet by Orazio Focardi, entitled 'I Partiti Politici alle 'Elezioni Generali,' of which the data are extracted from the Archivio di Statistica. Since 1861 the number of electors in Italy has increased by one-half, while the population has increased by one-fifth, in round numbers. Thus while in 1861 there were two hundred electors (accurately 192) to every 10,000 inhabitants, in 1880 there were 232 electors to every 10,000. The total number of voters in 1880 was 621,896, the population being estimated at 26,801,154. Of the electors 56 per cent. voted in 1861, and 60 per cent. in 1880. These 232 electors per 10,000 inhabitants of Italy are proportionally more numerous than is the case in Belgium, where there are 152 voters per 10,000 inhabitants. In Spain, Austria, and Switzerland the proportion of electors successively increases. In the United Kingdom, in 1880, there were 965 voters; in Germany, 2,135 voters; and in France, 2,695 voters for every 10,000 inhabitants. The proportion of electors who voted ranges from 20 to 80 per cent., the latter proportion being (said to be) attained in France in 1879. Signor Focardi has not been able to ascertain the proportion of voters to electors in England, owing to the varying number of votes possessed by each voter in different constituencies. We made the calculation in March 1880, that 63·4 per cent. of the total

number of possible votes were given among the metropolitan constituencies. In that election, 3,038,726 electors had votes, and 3,582,163 votes were recorded. The possible maximum of votes can scarcely have been less than 6,000,000. There seems to be no relation easy to determine between the character of the franchise and the proportion of voters who exercise it. In Switzerland, where there are 600 voters to every 10,000 inhabitants, only 17 per cent. of the country, and 40 per cent. of the town voters, voted in 1878.

On the question of education, the elucidation of which M. de Laveleye proposed as one of the principal objects of his tour, the information collected will be of less interest to the English public than many other portions of the book. Statistics of the number of schools, teachers, and scholars, are chiefly important to the technical student or writer on education, and are apt to weary the reader. The general result would seem to be that the main educational changes which the last ten years have wrought in Italy are with regard to the women. Not only are they taught, a fact which introduces an entirely new element into the domestic life of a great part of the peninsula, but they are more ready to come forward as teachers than are the young men. But it is painful to read of the miserable pittance doled out to the young female teachers—inadequate to the development of the woman, scarcely equal to the bare support of life. M. de Laveleye states that in many cases these young women are unable, from their want of due food and support, to go through the simple forms of gymnastic exercise which form a part of the course of the schools.

Here again surges up, with ever new force, the religious difficulty. What little teaching Italian women have hitherto received was at the hands of the priest. But it is one of the main features of the policy of the present Government to keep the priest out of the school. He is regarded as a natural enemy to the unity of Italy, and a wellwisher to the re-establishment of the temporal power of the Pope. How is the problem to be solved? Are the young to grow up without any religious teaching at all? This would be only to aggravate the danger which the wisest Italian statesmen see to be already arising from the decay of religious principles in Italy. Are they to be taught religion by laymen? Will not the result be the same? Are they to go to the priest for religious teaching alone? In that case will not the most powerful influence at the command of the clergy be directed to undermine the existing system of affairs? The question is one more easy to ask than to answer.

The great number of universities in Italy is a curious feature of the country. Italy, considering her financial position, does more than any other country for higher education. There are in Italy twenty-one universities, of which eight are of the first order, and seventeen are dependent on the Government. Four free universities, although they are under the same regulations as the others, are supported by their provinces: viz. Camerino, Ferrara, Perugia, and Urbino. The great universities have four faculties—Law, Medicine, Science, and Literature. Theology has been suppressed. The ordinary salary of a professor is 200*l.* a year. The eight universities of the first order are those of Naples, Turin, Padua, Pavia, Rome, Pisa, Bologna, and Palermo. In these are 440 professors, ordinary and extraordinary. Omitting Naples, in the absence of statistics, the number of students has declined from 6,818 in 1868 to 6,446 in 1875; a diminution which points to the increasing occupation of young men in active business. This multitude of academic bodies appears to us a great abuse. It arises from the former divisions of the country; but in a united Italy three great universities would be preferable to twenty-one small ones. One of the consequences is that Italy is overstocked with poor professors and discontented students.

In each great centre of Italian life, and in almost every conversation with an Italian statesman, the heavy pressure of the national and local public expenditure on the people is a foremost subject of anxiety. The pressure of the imposts on landed property is increased by the abuse made by the provinces and the communes of the power to impose 'the additional centimes.' The law forbids that these should exceed 100 per cent. of the original charge, but this law is violated in more than 5,000 communes. In 1871 these additions to the land tax for local expenditure amounted to 128 millions of francs. At present they have reached the sum of 172 millions, equal to more than 13 per cent. on the principal of the *impôt foncier*. It is not unfrequent that property is sold for the payment of the impost. In the six years from 1873 to 1878, 35,074 different properties were abandoned to the State for this cause. The communes spend lavishly on theatres, boulevards, large streets, statues, and fêtes. They gaily increase the heavy burden of their debts. The debts of the provinces have risen from fifty-six millions of francs to ninety millions in 1877, and the debts of the communes approach 800 millions. In Tuscany the communal debt amounts to 100 francs per inhabitant; in Florence to 800 francs; in Naples to 300

francs; in most of the large towns to 200 francs. If this goes on, remarks M. de Laveleye, a universal bankruptcy is at hand.

It is said that the Emperor Francis of Austria on one occasion, when travelling in Lombardy, asked a village schoolmaster what was the meaning of the three letters so frequently inscribed on the façade of the churches: 'D.O.M.' The schoolmaster boldly replied, *dominium omnia manducavit*, taxation has devoured everything. 'How much more true,' adds our informant, 'is this now!'

'Credit, which we have been taught to bless, as a beneficent fairy who multiplies the good things of humanity, has become for these populations a scourge worse than the plague and the famines of the Middle Ages; for they were transitory, and this is permanent. It is the abuse of credit which has ruined Turkey, Egypt, Italy, Austria, Russia—all the countries where the means of production are not proportionate to the exaggerated outlay of the Government. Credit is the most active of those agents of pauperisation which are now at work. It creates entire classes of fundholders, who live in idleness, and to pay whom the tax-gatherer tears from the wretched cultivators the fruit of their toil. Add the commissions and the premiums given on the raising of the loans.'

Without absolutely endorsing the above cry of distress, it is impossible to doubt that there is but too much cause for viewing with alarm the results of that fatal facility of borrowing which, with ourselves no less than with the Italians, has found a new field for its exercise in the various independent and irresponsible local authorities created throughout the country. The loans outstanding against the various local authorities in England in 1878 had reached the aggregate of 114,683,002*l.*, of which nearly one-fourth had been contracted in the last three years. The total expenditure of local taxation in that year was 49,328,646*l.*, which is somewhat unintelligibly divided into remunerative and non-remunerative. The rateable value of assessed property in England, at Lady Day 1878, comprising 649 unions and the Scilly Islands, was 131,021,019*l.*; so that local debt amounts to nearly a year's income of the property assessed to the poor rate. This is a state of things which even in England may justly give rise to serious reflections, for the truth is that nothing is more recklessly extravagant than popular administration by boards nominally responsible to large constituencies. But in Italy it has led the towns and communes to the verge of bankruptcy, and indeed beyond it. The State has been compelled to come to the relief of several great municipalities, but they are practically insolvent.

Very much of the outlay on local works in this country has been professedly encountered for sanitary purposes. The wild imprudence with which many of the new Urban and Rural Sanitary Authorities have plunged their contributories into useless cost may be measured by one consideration. The first thing needed for any comprehensive and economical dealing with the sewerage, drainage, or water-supply of a district is a good hydrographic survey of the whole watershed and river system of which it forms a part. In all the great Italian river-valleys this kind of survey has been admirably carried out by the engineers of the Government, and maps and tables giving the hydraulic statistics of his district are obtainable by every proprietor. In England none such exist. There is no hydrographic survey of even one of our great river-valleys, nor is the outflow of any of our rivers at this moment accurately known.

M. de Laveleye rather indicates than dwells upon the immense damage which has been done to Italy (and by no means to Italy alone) by the destruction of timber and of coppice. To this cause is mainly attributable the increased fury of the inundations of the Tiber, the Po, and other Italian rivers.

‘Two centuries ago, Tasso wrote

“L’Apennin la cui selva ombrosa e folta
Serve di scopa alla stellata volta.”

Now the mountains are bare, and malaria desolates the plains. At any cost the hills must be re-wooded, as the Marquis Ginori has done on his estates. The State should now act with a high hand, and enforce what is necessary.’

In grim confirmation of some of the foregoing gloomy views, M. de Laveleye points to the increase in the number of emigrants and to the increase in the number of criminals. The number of persons imprisoned, which in 1873 was 43,753, rose in 1878 to 48,037. Sixteen times as many murders are committed in Italy as in England. Rome enjoys in this respect an evil primacy. A homicide occurs there annually in every 19,458 inhabitants, while in Venetia there is only a homicide in every 225,519 inhabitants. The local differences in the murder-rate are striking. In Calabria there are 70 homicides per million of inhabitants per annum, in Florence 8, and in Turin 5. For robbery Rome also bears the palm, having 49 robberies for every 100,000 inhabitants. In Florence, for the same number of inhabitants, there are 2 robberies.

Of a feature of Italian scenery which never fails to strike the stranger—namely, the existence of certain desolate wastes within a short distance of spots where the untiring industry of

the *colono* utilises every inch of ground, and covers stony hills, that ascend more vertically than staircases, with the grey foliage of the Italian tree of life, the olive—M. de Laveleye has come in contact with only one example. It is true that it is the most striking. What will, we apprehend, be more novel to our readers is the political advantage which the Belgian statesman, adopting the views of an Italian of mark, attributes to the difficulty of inhabiting the neighbourhood of Rome.

‘Approaching Rome, we traverse the *Agro Romano*, still covered with water from the recent inundations of the Tiber. At the last station, two *mercanti di campagna* get into our carriage. They are the contractors for cultivation, who take on lease the *latifundia* of the *Campagna Romana*, and either sublet them for the pasturage of oxen, horses, and sheep, or cultivate them for corn crops at long intervals of time. They usually inhabit Rome. They command much capital, and grow rich. They are middle men, like those of Ireland. Their profit is charged on the rent of the proprietor, and on the wages of the workmen. Those who have just taken their seats by us are still young, very vigorous, of intelligent air, with fine energetic features. They speak with fire, and with a true eloquence. They laugh at the new law which the Parliament has voted for the “bonification” of the *Agro Romano*. It is a great question. As long as Rome was a dead city, the city of ruins, it was fitting that she should be surrounded by this mournful waste, struck with the curse of the *malaria*. But now that she is a modern and living capital, should she not combat the plague? The *malaria* commences in June, and lasts from that time to the commencement of the September rains, when it is especially dangerous. Even in the summer the nights are cruel. The heat is overwhelming, and it is not possible to allow the entrance of external air, for fear of the miasma.’

We may add with reference to this law, that the subject has engaged the very serious consideration of the Italian ministry, and that the measures proposed have been recommended by a technical commission, the president of which was the Commander Brauzzi. The report of the Commission was to the effect that it was hopeless to attempt the reclamation of the Pontine Marshes without finding the means both of cultivating and of peopling them. Into the cardinal question of drainage the report of the Commission does not enter, merely stating, as though no difficulty attached to the matter, that the areas which were suggested as the sites of four new villages are to be reclaimed and made accessible by roads paved and drained. But it is the opinion of many of the Italian engineers that the drainage of these marshes is by no means easy, if indeed it be possible. The soil, they say, is of so absorbent a nature that it sucks up moisture like a sponge,

and is not to be dried by the mere process of cutting a drain. To this we may add that there are some indications that at least one cause of the formation of these marshes may be geological depression. On the eastern coast of Italy such depression is known to have occurred. From the close of the sixteenth century the engineers of the Venetian Republic have observed a rise in the waters of the Adriatic as compared with the levels of the shore. Successive layers of clay, sand, and peat are found in Venetia at the respective depths of 32, 35, 93·5, and 143 yards. As peat can only form under certain conditions, it is inferred that four successive depressions of the coast have taken place. The rate of depression is estimated at from 5 to 7 inches per century.* At Rome the zero of the Ripetta hydrometer is only 0·97 mètres above the mean level of the sea. The original platform on which the ancient Pons Ælius was built is now 3 mètres below the zero of the hydrometer, or nearly 6 feet 6 inches below the sea-level at Ostia. It is highly improbable that the platform of the bridge could have been originally laid at such a depth. With the means at the command of the Romans it could only have been done by temporarily diverting the course of the Tiber. History is silent as to any such operation. It is far more likely that a depression such as that still in progress near the mouth of the Po has occurred since the time of regal Rome; and the effect of such a movement in the production of the Pontine Marshes is easy to understand. This view of the case is also of no small importance as regards the Herculean task of the control of the floods of the Tiber and the protection and drainage of the city of Rome.

M. Minghetti is not a believer in the economical possibility of the reclamation of the Pontine Marshes. In its actual condition, without maintenance of buildings, or cost of any kind, the land brings in a return to the proprietors of 100 francs per hectare, or nearly 1*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* per acre. Devoted to pasturage, it is safe from the *phylloxera*, from bad harvests, from the rivalry of American cereals. When 12*l.* or 14*l.* an acre has been sunk on it—to say nothing of a certain number of human lives—the returns will be more uncertain, and the annual cost permanent. It is with sincere regret that we have been compelled to afford to this view the support which its advocates can hardly fail to draw from our observations as to change of level.

Connected with this subject very closely is the attempt of

* Minutes of Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers, vol. lvii. p. 361; vol. lix. p. 384.

the Government to promote the restoration of forest and woodland on the hills, the barbarous stripping of which has so much increased the rapidity and destructive effects of floods, both in Italy and in France, not to say in our own island. Nothing, says M. de Laveleye, on his journey from Florence to Rome, can be more sad than the effects of erosion on the hills under culture. Little torrents swell till they cut ravines for their course. The earth is carried down and the fields are overwhelmed. The Apennines are, in this region, formed chiefly of clay, and offer no resistance to the process of destruction. Mountains of earth melt beneath the rain, and dry and crack beneath the sun; not a blade of vegetation appears, neither herb nor bush. All is naked and sterile.

Great hopes have been entertained of the beneficial effect of the Eucalyptus in destroying the *malaria* of the Campagna. The monks of the convent of Tre Fontane, near the Church of St. Paul without the walls, have made a plantation of these trees, with the result of being able to remain in their convent during the summer—a residence which, before the introduction of this aromatic and rapidly growing tree, would have been certainly fatal. But this is almost a sole instance of success. The causes of failure, however, may without doubt be traced either to the slovenliness of the planters, suspicious as they always are of novelty, or to the injudicious selection of the gum tree planted. There are, we believe, more than a hundred varieties of the species. We recommend to the notice of the Minister of Agriculture, who takes, M. de Laveleye tells us, a deep interest in sylviculture, the *Eucalyptus amygdalina*. The *Eucalyptus polyanthemus*, a native of South Australia, has survived thirty winters in the Royal Garden at Kew.

It can, however, only be in the event of a failure of efforts far more serious and better directed than has hitherto been the case, that we can take any comfort from the strong and respectful sympathy which the Belgian economist accords to the *malaria*. After all, says he, is it desirable that it should disappear? Is it not a happiness for Italy that her capital should be uninhabitable during a part of the year? M. de Laveleye sees in the increase of civilisation and the unmeasured growth of capitals one of the great dangers of modern life. To a great extent it is hard to disagree with this view. But when he refers to Washington and to Versailles, as proofs of the foresight and wisdom displayed by the Americans and by the French in placing their capitals in small towns without a great future to expect, and exclaims 'Felix malaria,' on the

ground that Rome, surrounded by her sombre 'Campagna,' can never so absorb the intellectual life of Italy as Florence would have done had she continued to be the capital, we can only wonder what gracious excuses he might not make for Edinburgh March winds or London fogs.

We shall exceed the space at our disposal if we linger on the very interesting passages in the work before us which relate to political economy, and to the contrast which M. de Laveleye points out between what he calls the orthodox or optimist school—those, namely, who adhere to the principles of Adam Smith, and those who invoke the active intervention of the State, for the improvement of society. As bearing, however, on scientific politics, the letter in which Dr. Pantaleoni, one of the most distinguished of the Roman senators, acknowledges the receipt of M. de Laveleye's '*Rapports de l'économie politique et de la démocratie*' (although, as the latter remarks, humoristic in tone), contains too much dry truth to be left untranslated.

'I have read your discourse with great interest, but permit me to make one or two remarks. I have three to offer you.

'1. History proves that the societies where conditions are equalised, and where democracy triumphs, are always conquered by nations where authority is established, or brute force is concentrated. Monarchies always devour republics, and your democratic society of workpeople will finish by having to work for a foreign master.

'2. There are races, such as the Chinese and the Negroes, which can produce more work, on less nourishment, than other races. The consequence of the terrible law of competition is, that the cheaper workfolk, or the inferior race, will devour the workfolk of superior race; unless, indeed, the latter decide to kill the former in order to prevent competition, which they seem, in fact, well disposed to do.

'3. But there are automatic or labour-saving machines, which eat less than the lowest races of mankind; thus machinery will destroy labour, except that which is devoted to the fabrication of machines—unless, indeed, the latter can be so improved as to reproduce themselves, like potatoes.

'That, it seems to me, is the point to which the laws of nature will lead us. How is it to be hindered? Can human laws prevent the torrent from overflowing?

'Joking apart, do you think that there is no truth in my sombre forecast?

'Yours truly,

'DR. PANTALEONI.'

That feature of the modern social system on which but little light can be cast from the study of the great writers on political science, the fearful increase of masses of 'hands,' in the service of the steam-engine, is one that evidently strikes M. de Laveleye (and not him alone) with terror.

'When we think of Italy, we see, in a dream, under the blue sky, in the shadow of her vines, beautiful young couples dancing to the sound of the tambourine. Alas! now they only dance at the call and for the money of foreigners. Where is the time in which the young girls, in open tunics, bounded joyously to the sound of the castanets? The youth of humanity and the youth of nature now exist only in the marble of ancient bas reliefs. The costume of the Roman country-women, which, since the time of Leopold Robert, every artist has drawn or painted, is now only to be found on the steps of La Trinità di Monte, worn by models. The petticoat and jacket have replaced it.'

'O cotton! I curse thee in the name of art and in the name of health! Gathered in grief and tears, by the negro in America, by the fellah in Egypt, or by the pariah of India; spun and woven in those immense factories where the human being, the woman, the child, are but the accessories of the machine of which the noise deafens them, and the unresting activity devours them; everywhere thou hast replaced the national costumes, so varied, so picturesque, so well adapted to the necessities of the climate. Where are those good woollen stuffs, of bright colours, woven, in the winter evenings, by the fireside, which gladdened the nightly tale or the popular song? Everywhere, from Russia to Spain, from Scotland to Sicily, we see the same blue cotton, sad and mean. At Moscow I have seen the women shivering in October in their old clothes, which they covered with ragged matting. In Andalusia are no longer to be seen the short skirts and petticoats waving round the hips. The Slaves of the Danube and the Save are the only people who have preserved, with their old family life, the costume of their ancestors; and I have admired at Sissek, and at Carlstadt, in Croatia, the shifts of the women, with their beautiful embroidery on breast and sleeves. But they cost more than a hundred francs. Soon they will acquire, with civilisation, shifts for twenty sous!'

This is a happy instance of the manner in which M. de Laveleye allows the taste of the artist, and even something of the inspiration of the poet, to sparkle amid the arid wastes familiar to the political economist. We cannot but think, however, that he has allowed his imagination to be unduly influenced by the exaggerated expressions of their misery in which the Italians may at times indulge. For a stranger in Italy the cry of the little beggar-boy, *morto di fame*, has at first a painful significance. But when he takes time to observe the extremely fat and roguish expression of the child who thus appeals to his sympathy, ragged and dirty as he may be, he comes to the conclusion that with him hunger must arise at very short intervals between meals. To anyone accustomed to the solid comfort and delicate cleanliness of the Low Countries, the dirt in which the Italians are wont, if not to delight, at least to dwell, is an evidence of a misery which these

objects of compassion do not feel. We are speaking now more particularly of the South. That there has been a very great rise in the price of the necessaries, as well as the luxuries, of life in Italy since 1860, we can confirm from practical experience. Nor is there any doubt that much hardship accompanies such changes. But when, as in this case, they are not directly produced by any change of legislation, but accompany an increased activity in all walks of life, it is far from being clear that the people in general suffer more than they gain. It is another thing to view with disfavour the disproportionate outlay on army, navy, and the enormous and costly establishments of the ministries. The infliction of the grist tax has been a burden, to avoid the pressure of which most of the Southern peasantry would have gladly welcomed the restoration of the rule of Ferdinand II. Under that astute sovereign, for everyone who went duly to church and did not trouble his head about politics, material comfort and prosperity were for the most part attainable. In Northern Italy, however, the state of the population is very different. There is not in Europe, not even in the west of Ireland, any region in which the peasantry are sunk in more squalid misery and destitution than in the Lomellina and the fertile valley of the Po, as we shall have occasion to show from official sources in our next Number. M. de Laveleye, however, saw nothing of this province.

‘Almost all the people whom we meet,’ says M. de Laveleye, in the course of an excursion in the neighbourhood of Albano, ‘beg.’ The monks set the example, and the work-people faithfully follow it. The man who is familiar with Italy knows that there are certain centres of begging, where mendicancy is the main industry of the place. Such, in a remarkable degree, is Pozzuoli. At the same time in other places, as on the Adriatic seaboard, begging, twenty years ago, was unknown; and in many parts of Italy, as in the lovely plain of Sorrento, it is, or was, only exercised by well-known professional beggars, who would strike the window-frames with their sticks and threaten to go away if they were not immediately relieved. The tourist is the father of the beggar; at least it is in the spots which every tourist is regularly understood to visit that mendicancy chiefly thrives.

From the list of prices which M. de Laveleye gives of articles of consumption at Rome, it will be seen that the idea he has formed of the misery of the lower classes there is somewhat exaggerated. Bread, he says, is 45 centimes the kilogramme, which is about fourpence for a half-quartern loaf. Wine is

40 centimes the litre, or about nine farthings the pint. Fine olive oil, an important article of diet, is a franc and a half the litre, or some eightpence halfpenny the pint. Pork chops are tenpence per pound, and fried potatoes 15 centimes the kilogramme, or three farthings the pound. The rate, of from a franc to a franc and a half, of the daily wages of the workman is therefore far from being so low as to reduce him to the hard necessity, so much lamented by our author, of living on dry bread and water. These prices are those of Rome, and, unless in the case of the ready-fried potatoes, are, no doubt, considerably higher there than in the environs. M. de Laveleye recommends to the friends of the Italian agriculturists the study of 'the question of the rabbit, in its relation to the alimentation of the lower classes.'

The cheerful companionship afforded by the pig—*le cochon familier* M. de Laveleye calls him—to the Italian working man, is another of those features in which there is so much in common between the Italian and the Irish peasant. The intellectual powers of the pig are very far from being either understood or developed as a general rule. He is sadly brutalised by his English education; the fact being that so long as the chief duty imposed on the animal is to fatten, his energetic mental powers are lulled into atrophy. If kept tolerably hungry, the pig is an excellent sentinel.

'When the cultivator,' says our author, 'goes to the field, a lively young pig trots after him like a dog. While his master works, he seeks his own food in the neighbourhood, and in the evening returns home. Here we can understand the companion of St. Anthony. Dogs are much more rare in the farms than is the case in Belgium. Nowhere have I seen so few dogs as in Italy. It is true economy. Better the pig who earns than the dog who costs.'

M. de Laveleye does justice to the Italian pig, and speculates on the important question whether the juicy excellence of the flesh of the wild boar, with its proper *agro dolce* sauce, is due to the pasturage of the animal on the acorns of the evergreen oak.

As the final result of his observations on the actual state of Italy, M. de Laveleye expresses his accord with certain remarks which he cites from a recent work by Signor Jacini, entitled 'I Conservatori e l'evoluzione naturale dei Partiti Politici in Italia: '—

'Consider first the favourable side of the situation of Italy. Natural frontiers perfectly defined. No exterior enemy to dread. No neighbour coveting its provinces. A national dynasty devoted to the country and to liberty, very popular throughout the country, and with all classes. An educated army, undivided by political opinions. A

noblesse more friendly than any other to progress in all its forms, of science, of art, and of letters. A great intellectual activity everywhere; and among the young an ardent desire for instruction. Numerous *foci* of scientific culture. A population that is very intelligent, and, whatever may be said to the contrary, very laborious, when it is assured of the fruits of its work. No religious fanaticism; not even among the clergy. No great industries, or great capital accumulating masses of workpeople on a single point.

‘Now look at the reverse. The worst evil, in my opinion, and the source of all others, is the too unequal distribution of property, whence it results that the largest part of the population has to live upon insufficient and intermittent wages. Above all, extreme poverty in the rural classes. Crushing taxes; the State, the provinces, and the communes abusing credit for unproductive expenses. Many private individuals spending more than their income; in consequence very slow increase of capital. Crimes and offences more frequent than anywhere else, and augmenting at an alarming rate. In the South, less security than in any other civilised country. Justice tardy and powerless. The verdicts of juries often a veritable scandal. Associations of malefactors, like the Camorra and the Mafia, establishing in some towns a sort of reign of terror. Revolutionary sects persistent in certain provinces. Abuse of political influence. The parliamentary system working detestably, for want of well-constituted parties. Incessant ministerial crises, depriving the Government of all authority and of any power to do good. The press active, but too often made the organ of personal interests or of ambitious coteries. Many discontented, to wit, in the little towns, the small tradesfolk chattering politics in the cafés and in the streets; and in the country districts the peasants, skinned by rent and taxes, ready to accept the wildest doctrines of socialism. The deplorable ambition of playing a part in the complications of European politics, and among a small but noisy party the fatal idea of profiting by them in order to filch from our neighbours some shreds of territory, while all our efforts should be directed to making life more tolerable.

In sum, I seem to perceive in Italy many disquieting elements, but without the lever which makes revolutions, a revolutionary capital.

The truth and force of this nervous summary are indubitable. In the remainder of this, the closing chapter of the book, it is not clear whether we listen to the words of Signor Jacini or of M. de Laveleye. We enter more into the region of speculation, but it is a speculation at once intelligent and interesting. ‘The sovereigns,’ says our author, ‘who create a great capital at the expense of provincial life, prepare the fate of royalty.’ But the largest capital in the world, while containing the palaces of one of the most ancient of European lines of sovereigns, has grown rather in spite of than by the act of the Crown. How far King James I. of England would have sympathised with this view of the Belgian economist

may be doubted; but that he and succeeding sovereigns did their best to prevent the growth of the capital is well known. At present the royal residence is rather an unavoidable accident of the existence of London, avoided as much as possible, than a central element of city growth. 'A centre where everything converges, and where everything is decided, is also a shoal for a republic,' continues M. de Laveleye:—

'The return of the Chambers to Paris is a great fault. I can conceive that the enemies of the Republic might have demanded it, but no true Republican should ever have consented to it. If they destroy the *malaria*, Rome will become a second Paris, and royalty will be in danger.'

The Papal question, our author holds, sticks like a dart in the flanks of Italy. The Sovereign Pontiff of two hundred millions of Catholics out of Italy is the irreconcilable foe of the unity of the country. The reader of these words may recall the prophetic doctrine of Machiavelli, that the maintenance of the papal power essentially depended on the political disunion of the two parts of the peninsula, and that if ever the two were united under one powerful sovereign, the rule of the popes would come to an end. All the wisest and most foreseeing popes, the Florentine statesman tells us, were aware of this vital secret, the possession of which was the true key to the papal policy. It is remarkable how the events which have occurred under our very eyes confirm the truth of the keen vision of this master of the art of dominion; and the unconscious echo given to the ancient note of warning in the pages of '*L'Italie Actuelle*' is by no means one of the least striking features of an interesting book.

The dangers foreseen by the Italian statesman from the relations of the papacy to the kingdom are twofold. In the interior, there is the fear of the clerical party obtaining the command of the elections, and thus stopping the wheels of government. From without is the danger of a crusade on the part of those Catholic states in which the clergy may become dominant. M. Jacini proposes to meet the danger by a mode which M. de Laveleye considers would be the height of imprudence. He would convert the present 'law of guarantees' into an international treaty, that should have the object of definitively regulating the question of the papacy. Italy, in that case, thinks our author, would lose her independence. The only solution of this complex problem which M. de Laveleye thinks possible is, 'that the Italians should abandon a form of worship which has for its avowed aim to destroy not only their liberties, but even their nationality.' But we

have seen a few pages back that this abandonment is precisely that which is taking place throughout Italy, and the progress of which has filled the Belgian, no less than the Italian, statesmen with so much well-founded alarm.

The sympathies, and probably the hopes, of the author are, it is not difficult to see, with the Vaudois. That this pure and venerable relic of very early Christianity has long shed a ray of truth amid mediæval darkness is unquestionable. But with its small body of 15,000 communicants, and with its allies, the Free Italian Church (which is akin to our own Kirk), the Wesleyan communion, the Baptist sect, and a number of reformed churches belonging to foreign residents in Italy, the task of winning to its faith the benighted populations of Central Italy may well be considered as hopeless. ‘These ‘different groups,’ says M. de Laveleye, ‘pursue their work ‘of propagandism with great devotion, and gain recruits even ‘under the thunder of the Vatican, which recently drew a cry ‘of indignation from Leo XIII.’ Our eyes have seen strange things come to pass in Italy, but the establishment in the south of a form of worship so pure, zealous, and simple as that of the Vaudois would be more marvellous than any step in the revolution extending from 1860 to 1880.

ART. VII.—1. *Report of the Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for War to inquire into certain Questions that have arisen with respect to the Militia and the present Brigade Dépôt System.* 1877.

2. O’BYRNE’S *Collection of Army Circulars.* 1867 to 1879.

3. *Premature Enlistment.* By Sir E. SULLIVAN, Bart. 1880.

4. *Ordnance Store Regulations.* 1880.

NO problem has more continuously occupied public attention during the last quarter of a century than the military system of this country. Ever since the Crimean War it has been patent to everyone who has examined the question, that our army has never yet attained a satisfactory condition. The War Office, the Horse Guards, enlistment and promotion in the army, the militia, in fact, every part, both of the army and auxiliary forces, have been subjected to change. Some very able army officers, some of the leading statesmen of the day, have given their best energies to the work of reform, but the result has not been successful. Each alteration has brought in proposals for fresh changes, and each new War Minister finds the question still unsolved. It is fortunate

that the material of which our army is composed is able in emergencies to rise superior to organisation, and that whether on the sands of Africa or in the rugged fastnesses of Afghanistan, we find officers capable of leading, and soldiers ready to follow, who maintain to their full extent the traditions of the British army of conquering or dying for its country.

The reason for the unsatisfactory position of our army organisation lies in the very complex nature of the problem. In the case of continental armies, in the case of the small army of the United States, the objects to be obtained by the maintenance of an army are comparatively simple. Their armies are levied chiefly for the defence or control of a homogeneous territory, or for aggression on a neighbouring state; their colonies are not numerous; they have no distant empires to rule over. With England the case is different. She has, like other nations, to maintain an army for home defence and for the maintenance of order, and, although we do not consider it possible or desirable for England to vie with continental nations in providing armies for aggressive warfare in Europe, yet she must be able to put an effective although a small army on continental ground if called on to do so. But England also possesses numerous distant colonies and fortresses which she must be prepared to hold against aggression. She has an empire in the East which requires in time of peace as large an army of occupation as is required for the mother country; and whilst a further extension of our dominion by the sword in Asia need not be anticipated, yet, in time of war or of insurrection in India, the army then necessary would under any circumstances make a very heavy demand on the resources of England. These several requirements present conditions which, if not incompatible with each other, are at least somewhat dissimilar. In reviewing the history of the changes in the army which commenced after the Crimean War, we cannot but feel that the chief reason for the want of success which has attended the efforts of the reformers has arisen from the fact that those who made the first changes did not clearly define in their own minds the requirements of a complete military system, nor did they entirely appreciate the intricacy of the problem. The government of the army was then vested in three principal departments of State: that of the *Personnel* under the Commander-in-Chief, who was directly under the Sovereign; that of the *Matériel*, which was under the Master-General of Ordnance, a Cabinet Minister responsible to Parliament; that of *Finance*, under the Secretary at War, also a Minister of State. The provision of money from the Treasury chest and the

Commissariat was under a department of the Treasury. The Secretary of State for War was also Secretary of State for the Colonies. These various officials and their departments had functions which overlapped and sometimes clashed. The military command of the Artillery and Engineers was not under the Commander-in-Chief. The regulation of the pay and allowances of the army was divided between the Secretary at War, the Master-General of the Ordnance, and the department of the Treasury which administered the Commissariat. The inconveniences arising from this state of things, which the Crimean War divulged, led to the creation of the department of the Secretary of State for War and to the abolition of the offices of Master-General of Ordnance and Secretary at War. But viewed by our present lights, it is not clear that many of the difficulties of organisation which have followed the sweeping changes which were made after the Crimean War might not have been obviated, had the effort made at that time been directed rather to mend and modify the existing state of things than to overturn it.

In examining the records of these changes which are buried in Hansard and in reports of committees of the Houses of Parliament or of departmental commissions, no very distinct appreciation of the nature of the army organisation which was sought for can be found. But there was one leading person who at that day appears to have had clearly in his mind the problem to be solved, and who, had he lived, would probably long ere this have caused the tangled skein to be unravelled, and educed an harmonious organisation. The late Prince Consort sketched out in brief and forcible language in 1855 what were the defects of our military system:—

‘I hazard the opinion that our army as at present organised can hardly be called an army at all, but a mere aggregate of battalions of infantry with some regiments of cavalry and an artillery regiment. . . . During the Peninsular War, by the genius of the Duke of Wellington, the British force for the first time assumed such numbers, and was kept so long together, as to enable him to introduce an army system. It came out of the contest with the admiration of the world, but at the signature of peace this army, as such, was broken up. . . . In fact, the army has never been acknowledged by the nation as a national want, with recognised claims to its consideration. We have nothing but distinct battalions. Occasionally some of them have been thrown together *à l'improptu* to meet a war in some foreign climate suddenly thrust upon the country, and generally not foreseen. Some old general officer, usually the accidental senior on the nearest station, has been put in command, with a staff formed by him in haste from his younger friends and relations. . . . We have in consequence, as I

have said, admirable battalions, but nothing beyond,—no generals (as a rule) trained and practised in the duties of that rank (for as soon as a colonel obtains that rank, he is, as a system, placed on the half-pay, and not afterwards employed, except, if at all, as inspecting officer in a district or as commandant of a garrison); no general or staff corps (to the organisation of which all Continental Powers have paid the most special and minute attention); no field commissariat, no field army department, no ambulance corps, no baggage train, no corps of drivers, no corps of artisans, no practice or possibility of acquiring it in the three arms—cavalry, infantry, and artillery; no general qualified to handle more than one of these arms, and the artillery kept as distinct from the army as if it were a separate profession.'

As already mentioned, the first step taken in army reform after the Crimean War was to place the whole of the army departments under one minister, viz. under the Secretary of State for War; and between that time and 1870 numerous changes took place which were intended to improve the army organisation.

It is now about nine years since we reviewed the history of the Military Forces of the Crown, as described by Mr. Clode. We then pointed out: 1st. The unsatisfactory features of the present system of recruiting, to which might be traced much of the desertion, and much of the necessity for numerous military prisons. 2nd. The total dislocation between the militia and the line; two bodies which should be closely bound together and mutually support each other; and between the regiments and the reserves. 3rd. The cumbersome and unwieldy civil administration. 4th. The negation of all proper responsibility to the superior combatant officers. 5th. The superfluity of officers in the higher grades. To these we would add the degradation of military rank by the profusion of honorary titles scattered broadcast over all branches of the service. And the enormous cost of the army in proportion to the small number of men. We endeavoured to show on that occasion what were the alterations then required in our army, in order to obtain a simpler, a more reasonable, and a cheaper system of organisation, and to render the army an efficient machine, both for the defence of the country and for the protection of our Colonial and Indian Empires.

One of the more pressing problems which required to be solved in 1872 was that of creating a body of professional officers; and we advocated, what had become apparent to all army reformers, that the first step required in this direction was the abolition of the Purchase System; moreover, the vested interests which that system created were an effectual barrier to alterations in the *cadres* and other matters connected

with the *personnel* of the troops. Another important problem was to weld into one homogeneous army our various forces, which consisted of different elements; viz. the army, the militia, the volunteers, and the reserves. In that article we advocated compulsory enrolment for the militia, as the constitutional basis of national defence. But although we still continue to believe that it is an essential feature of an efficient military system for this country, we are convinced that the spirit of party in which all these questions are approached will prevent the adoption of this national element of safety, unless an emergency should arise, such, for instance, as an actual invasion, which would bring home to the public mind the necessity of making some personal sacrifices for securing the defence of the country.

Lord Cardwell approached the question with boldness, and with sound views so far as the *personnel* of the army is concerned; and it is to be regretted that political changes prevented him from remaining in office long enough to have had the full responsibility of completing the reforms which he initiated; because, in consequence of the manner in which the changes have been worked out, the reforms which Lord Cardwell introduced have not had all the success which he stated that he anticipated. Lord Cardwell did not, however, realise the fact that thorough efficiency in the army machine will never be attained until the view of decentralisation, shadowed out by the Prince Consort in 1855, is acted on, and until each army corps is made a complete unit for the management of which the general in command is responsible in every particular.

The reforms which Lord Cardwell introduced may be roughly classed under:—1st. Abolition of purchase for officers. 2nd. Curtailment of the period of service for the men, and the contingent acceleration of the formation of a reserve force. 3rd. Localised depôts for regiments, and the system of linked battalions to provide reinforcements for foreign and colonial service. 4th. Remodelled supply services.

1. The abolition of purchase was the keystone to the creation of an army, because the efficiency of the army depends upon its officers, and the efficiency of the officers depends upon their promotion by merit, that is, promotion by selection, which could only take place on rare occasions under the purchase system. It is unnecessary here to enter into the vexed question of the manner in which purchase was abolished, because each succeeding year diminishes the recollection of the difficulties, inequalities, and individual grievances necessarily incidental to so great a change. But there was one feature of the purchase

system which undoubtedly influenced the *morale* of the army, and which cannot be replaced by seniority in promotion. Purchase was a relic of the feudal system and of the days of chivalry. It originated in officers who had raised a troop or a regiment at considerable expense handing the command over to another officer on repayment of the cost. It was practically paying for the honour and privilege of serving the sovereign, instead of serving for wages. The honour of having done faithful service or achieved some noble deed was the sole reward. The character of the service is altered when the amount of service is appraised by the wages it brings; a money standard replaces an ideal standard; and the desire for distinction, the spirit of emulation, must be fostered by other means. The old traditions of the army will long hang around it, and animate the body, in spite of the deadening influence of promotion by rotation. But an army requires more than this: the spirit of success is a spirit of continual emulation, of desire in everyone to surpass his fellow in either deeds of daring or in the faithful execution of duty. This spirit can only be permanently fostered by the principle of selection.

On a former occasion we advocated the application of the five years' rule to every officer in a regiment, in order that an opportunity should be afforded of causing idle and bad officers to disappear. This rule has been applied to the commanding officers of regiments. And five years of careful administration of details, such as is now required from the commanding officer of a regiment, will, as a rule, be as much time as most men will give to the duty without sliding into perfunctory administration. The method of promotion under the new system has not, however, yet attained a fixed basis.

No doubt it is easy to find objections to a rigid rule of selection, and many officers advocate seniority tempered by rejection, or by rejection and selection. But an officer must have done something very bad to be ordered to retire; and if seniority is admitted to be the rule, it would lull the easy-going young officer into the perfunctory discharge of his duties; and it would be in rare cases that it could be departed from in favour of selection, without raising much criticism. Whereas, under the action of a principle of selection, stimulating the spirit of emulation throughout the service, every officer would strain his energies to the utmost, and the inefficient officer would retire of himself after having been passed over two or three times. But selection would speedily become discredited if based on general impressions; it is therefore necessary that a clearly defined system and a tangible machinery should be

created for regulating the selection. There is in both the French and Prussian armies a machinery for this purpose.

The system which would appear to present the fewest objections would be periodical confidential reports from the colonels of regiments upon the officers of the battalions, and from general officers upon the officers of their own staff, to be laid before a special tribunal at the Horse Guards. The general idea we would shadow out is that such a tribunal should be composed of a certain number of general officers who have recently received promotion, representing the different branches of the service, and who should hold the appointment for a limited period so arranged that the change of members should be gradual. This tribunal should examine the confidential reports and record the services of every officer, and should advise the Commander-in-Chief on every case of promotion. Of course, where there is no distinct superiority of one officer over another, seniority would determine the case of promotion; an officer repeatedly passed over would be recommended to leave the service. The confidential reports should be communicated to the officer himself, who, if he had any good in him, would thereby be stimulated to renewed exertion in the fulfilment of his duties.

The purchase system possessed the advantage of accelerating the flow of promotion without loading the pension list. The new system of retirement dismisses officers from the army in the prime of life because they have had the ill luck not to earn promotion; at a time too when their experience renders their services valuable. For instance, non-purchase captains of 40 years of age and 20 years of service who have not been promoted are ineligible for further promotion, but may retire on a small pension, and are liable to be called out with the reserves. Majors after seven years' service as major, and over a certain age, are dismissed in the prime of life. To many of these officers retirement is practically ruin, and we have grave doubts whether this system will not create dissatisfaction in the tax-paying community, when it becomes apparent that a large number of pensioned officers are spread over the country, their occupation gone, who have barely attained middle age, although they are well fitted for employment, and who will not conceal their dissatisfaction at their services having been dispensed with. On this account, as well as for other reasons to which we shall presently allude, the employment in the auxiliary forces of those officers whose age compels their retirement from the ranks of the army should be placed upon a systematic basis. But the purchase system led to the growth of many

anomalies in the position of the officers. For instance, the appointment of honorary colonels of regiments could only be defended on the ground that they had spent large sums on the service, which they had forfeited by remaining in the service to attain the rank of general; and so long as purchase officers remain on the lists this reason must exist. Mr. Childers, however, in reply to Mr. Trevelyan's motion in the House of Commons last summer, complaining of the abnormal number of general officers retained on the active list, stated that he was prepared, after ascertaining the effect of the prospective changes, to get rid of the honorary colonels upon a basis which would do no injustice to those in the service who had reasonable expectations; and that he was prepared to make arrangements to place the appointment, the promotion, the number, and the retirement of the general officers of the army on a satisfactory footing. This is the true spirit in which the subject should be approached; but we would add that this, as well as all other matters of army pay, should be governed by the broad principle enunciated by Mr. Trevelyan, that public servants should be paid either in the shape of salary for work that was still doing, or of pension for work that had been done, a principle that has hitherto been much overlooked in army appointments.

2. Next to the abolition of purchase, Lord Cardwell's efforts to create an adequate reserve force, by limiting the period of service with the ranks, have attracted the greatest share of attention. In moving the Army Estimates in 1872, Lord Cardwell said we ought 'not to cease to enlist men under the present system, which has furnished a strong and reliable army, until we have provided a new system for furnishing us with an army of reserve, and found how it would answer.' The general idea of an efficient reserve appears to have been to secure protection against invasion, and to fill up the vacancies in regiments in a great European war; but the insufficiency of that view was clearly shown at the time of the Zulu war. It was then proved that if a reserve is to be of real utility, it must be available to be called upon to fill up the ranks on the occasion of any war in which the regiment to which the reserves are attached is required to serve.

In carrying out the reforms which Lord Cardwell initiated, more consideration seems to have been given to the importance of forming a reserve than to that of keeping the army efficient. Indeed, six years after that speech, when the Zulu war had made a sudden call on our troops, there were thirty-one battalions of the line on the home establishment which had an

average of only 128 men who had completed two years' service; two of these, the 50th and 103rd, had only 81 and 48 men who had this length of service. The Zulu campaign brought prominently into notice the failure of a system which provided regiments of boys. And there has been no official reply to Dr. Russell's statements of the frequent 'scares' from which the troops suffered during the war, nor of his description of the demoralised state of the troops after the war. We do not wish to be misunderstood in this matter. We do not despise youth in a soldier. Youth is the period of enthusiasm, and history shows that many of the most daring deeds have been done, and glorious victories obtained, by young soldiers. Youth has always been an element of success in a fighting army, provided the youths are made steady by means of a proportion of trained soldiers, and by efficient non-commissioned officers. But there are youths and youths. It is not so much the youth as the immaturity of our recruits that is in fault. The immature age of our soldiers is not attributable alone to short service. Short service has brought the evil into prominence. Short service does not necessarily mean an immature rank and file—that evil is due to premature enlistment. The recruit is taken at too early an age. The age at which recruits are enlisted is nominally eighteen, but in reality some are taken at sixteen, and many at seventeen years of age: these are growing boys. General Edwards reported that recruits grew on an average in the first year one inch in height, and increased sixteen pounds in weight and two inches round the chest. The soldiers we now enlist may scarcely have done growing after their six years of service with the colours. With us a large proportion of the army is under twenty; and thus, whilst under the system of long service there were probably two old and seasoned soldiers to every recruit, under the present system there may be several boys or immature men to every old soldier. The first quality of a soldier is to bear fatigue and privation; on the average, men are best able to resist these between the ages of twenty-three and thirty. In the short service of the German army the men are taken between the ages of twenty and twenty-seven, though mostly at about twenty, and that furnishes a mature army—indeed, it forms one of the finest armies which the world has seen. Lord Sandhurst unceasingly inveighed against the early enlistments. In the debate on Lord Cardwell's bill on army service, he said, 'In every continental army care is taken to 'provide grown men for the service; in the British army

‘every regulation is framed with the intention of providing ‘ungrown starveling boys.’ The short service system, which has entailed an annual recruiting of some 25,000 to 27,000 recruits a year, has brought this feature of our recruiting into prominence. It would be a great advantage if the age of our recruits were fixed at twenty or twenty-one instead of its present limit of eighteen, for then we should at least secure ourselves against recruits of sixteen and seventeen years of age. But the argument against such a limitation is very strong, viz. that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to find an adequate number of recruits of twenty or twenty-one years of age. It not only means that additional inducements must be held out for men to enter the army at that age, but it means that young men who have already entered upon their trades or apprenticeships shall leave them for the army. There are many youths who would take to soldiering before they have settled down to a trade who would not be disposed to do so afterwards, and who would scarcely be tempted by any bounty which the State could give. We have no doubt raised a large number of recruits with comparative ease during the last few years; but those were years of bad trade, when recruiting is always comparatively easy, and it does not follow that when trade revives we shall find the same facility. Older recruits would materially benefit the service, and be a measure of indirect economy. But the main object would be attained provided we could secure a full period of short service from mature young men. On the other hand, in an efficient army, the presence of men whose whole wish is to desert or leave it is not desirable; and many men, after enlisting, may be found to be very undesirable soldiers. To meet this, a suggestion has been made that the recruit should be considered on probation for fifteen months, and that during that period of fifteen months, and after the recruit had been drilled, he would be liable to be transferred to any battalion unless promoted to be a non-commissioned officer in a regiment. It would also be optional with the commanding officer to discharge him, if found unfit for service; it has also been suggested that power should be reserved to the recruit to terminate his engagement during the fifteen months, upon a month’s notice, but there is danger that such a rule would lose many recruits because of the irksomeness of the early period of drill; indeed, it may be a question whether the permission for the recruit to purchase his discharge at a low rate should not be curtailed. In case of re-enlistment, the first service would count in the fifteen months. At the

expiration of the fifteen months he would be passed as a trained soldier, with some distinctive mark in the uniform, and, if possible, with a trifling increase of pay. If the period of engagement were made to commence when the recruit is passed as a trained soldier, it would no doubt go far to free the ranks from immature youths: but the liability of a recruit to be transferred without his own consent might act perniciously; men who become soldiers from a liking for the profession carefully select their battalion either because they have friends in it, or because they wish to serve in the part of the globe where it is likely to be stationed. In a voluntary army a hard and fast line of enlistment for general service keeps out some of the best recruits. On the other hand, many do not object to general service; it ought to be left optional, and if each recruit who enlisted for general service received a small allowance on being called on to leave the battalion he first entered, a sufficiently large number of general service men would be secured.

We suggested in 1871 the use of the militia as a recruiting ground for the line. This has been done to a certain extent. Whilst in 1872-3 there were 4,324 recruits who joined the line from the militia, in 1877-8 there were 10,696. Colonel Stanley's committee recommended an extension of the arrangements for this purpose. A militiaman who had undergone two trainings might, on a special report, be passed at once into the ranks without the preliminary fifteen months' training. Recruiting should be encouraged from the militia, and also from the volunteers, of men who had had two trainings. For such men it might be well worth while to hold out additional inducements in the shape of increased bounty, or even of some addition to the pay.

There are collateral advantages in a short service system. On the one hand, it enables the commanding officer to weed out inefficient men, bad-conduct men, and skulkers, and to retain for longer service the real soldiers; on the other hand, it allows men who desire it to pass out of the active army after a limited period of service. It reduces the number of married soldiers, and the pension list. It is, however, necessary to consider the effect of short service on the requirements of regiments for colonial and Indian service. In an army for home service, short service presents no difficulties; but troops serving in the colonies or in India ought to be fairly trained men before they leave England; and for purposes of economy they ought to remain abroad for a full period of service; indeed, it would be preferable, if it were possible,

that the regiment should be moved as a complete body; that is to say, that it should go out complete, and return complete. Of course in practice this is impossible. There will, moreover, always be vacancies by deaths and by invaliding, whose places must be supplied from time to time from home; but it is undesirable to add unnecessarily to the number thus required to be sent out by a large percentage of time-expired men. Moreover, there are certain objections to sending out to India a large proportion of young soldiers, which do not rest on considerations of expense alone. Dr. Bryden's elaborate statistics on the health of British troops serving in India show that the death-rate of men who have been from five to seven years in the country is 8·83 per 1,000; whilst the death-rate of soldiers who have been in the country from one to four years is 12·5 per 1,000; and that of soldiers resident above seven years is 14·54 per 1,000. Thus the soldiers suffer more by death in the first three years of residence than in the succeeding four years. The loss by enteric fever is largely greater in the earlier years of service; thus, in the first four years the loss by enteric fever is 22 per 100 of the whole deaths; whilst in the fifth, sixth, and seventh years it is only five per cent. of the total deaths, and it is still less in the older soldiers. The invaliding is similarly larger proportionately in the earlier years of service. Thus of 5,724 soldiers who broke down in the five years 1871 to 1875, in the first four years of residence, 3,071 were men of one and two years' service; 2,653 were invalided in the third and fourth year; of these 2,965 were young men under twenty-five years of age, and 2,759 were above that age.* The general conclusion which Dr. Bryden's statistics show is that whilst it is undesirable for soldiers to remain in India after from thirty to thirty-four years of age, it is equally undesirable to remove healthy men as soon as they are acclimatised; but that the younger unformed soldiers suffer much; and that immature youths should not be sent to India. It has been urged that a system of service better adapted to the Indian regiments than the short service system should be sought to be combined with that system for the purposes of the Indian army. But although there is a strong feeling in favour of lengthening the period of service in India and the colonies generally, it is essential, if the army is to be

* Many years are required to obtain reliable Indian averages; and although 1877, which was one of the most healthy years on record for troops, gave better results, still those were not sustained by the experience of 1878.

kept homogeneous, that the regulations as to service should be applicable to the whole army; and we are doubtful of the expediency of creating a separate Indian army. To meet the difficulty of Indian and colonial service, it has been suggested on high authority that all Line recruits should be enlisted for nine years with the colours, and six years with the reserve; but that all men in excess of establishment in battalions on return from abroad, who have more than six years' service, should be transferred to the reserve. In discussing the question of length of service, there are considerations affecting a volunteer army which are of little account in one raised by conscription. The conscript is compelled to serve whether he likes it or not. The volunteer, on the other hand, takes to soldiering because he likes it. He adopts it as a trade or profession, in preference to other means of employment. But under short service the mere fact of serving as a soldier deprives him of the power of acquiring or prospering in another trade; and when he leaves the service, he is comparatively unfit for skilled labour, and can only select from the better classes of employment which are open to the unskilled labourer. It follows that under the present system of short service, the soldier, after his period of reserve service is over, is thrown entirely on his own resources, as an unskilled labourer, as he advances in life, and obtains no compensation for the sacrifice of his earlier years. To such men who take a fancy to soldiering as a profession, it is cruelty to be turned adrift to seek a living as best they can, when they are comparatively young, and when they have a predilection for the service and are ready to give their lives to the State. It will take many years before the actual facts entailed by these conditions of service will be brought to the notice of the mass of the people; but it is quite certain that in the long run, as the reserve men gradually pass away, comparatively young, into the population, they will carry with them and disseminate regrets that they ever entered so thankless an employment. They will spread the feeling, as expressed by Lord Hardinge, that the nation treats its soldiers like oranges, that having sucked them dry, it throws them aside.

Whilst the manner in which the short service system has been worked has ignored the necessity for keeping up a proportion of trained soldiers, it has also failed to produce efficient non-commissioned officers. It would almost seem as if those who had had the control had thought that the one thing needful was so to work it as only to increase the reserves—a system of working which may even intensify the evils of the

short service. For the purposes of creating a reserve, it may be advisable to limit the privates to their term of first enlistment; but all non-commissioned officers, including corporals, should be permitted to extend their service for twenty-one years, of which a portion might be *de rigueur* in the auxiliary forces, and then proceed to pension; the amount of pension should be such as gives them material assistance in their old age. Soldiers who are worth pensioning are those who, whilst they look upon the army as their profession, are desirous of rising in it. Whilst we do not advocate a large promotion from the ranks, we would not entirely shut the door to such promotion. But we would make the position of non-commissioned officers, both in pay and pension, one which would satisfy the reasonable aspirations of the majority of those of the class from which soldiers are usually drawn. Indeed, the non-commissioned officers should be permitted to adopt the army as a permanent profession, not necessarily limited by twenty-one years' service. The non-commissioned officers thus allowed to re-engage, if reduced to the ranks, would be liable to be passed into the reserve, after six years' service in the ranks, to complete the period for which they had engaged. Under arrangements such as these, the less earnest soldier would be able to pass into the reserves, and be freed from what would be to him the irksomeness of serving with the colours after he had been thoroughly drilled. The more enthusiastic soldier would be induced to remain with the colours, and the position of non-commissioned officers would become a prize worthy to be contended for by all good soldiers.

3. The next question which Lord Cardwell dealt with was that of localising the depôts of regiments. He erected, in different parts of the country, at a considerable expense, a series of dépôt barracks, for the drilling of recruits, and created the system of linked battalions for the purpose of feeding the regiments on service with men fit for the duties of a campaign. The principle of organisation upon which the British army is founded is that of the regiment. The Roman unit was the legion. With us, who have not required to move such large masses, the regiment became the unit. It is upon the perfection of our regimental system that our former successes have depended, and upon that perfection we must rely in the future. Any organisation which tends to sap our regimental system must end in disaster.

The localising of the depôts of regiments was an important step, *per se*, in the direction of improving this feature of army organisation; but the working out of the idea thus inaugurated

through the agency of linked battalions has not proved a success. It broke down on the first strain of a small war. The trained men of the Army Reserve could only be called out in case of great national emergency; therefore regiments sent to the scene of operations had to be made up to a war complement partly by recruits and partly by young soldiers drafted from every available regiment. The regiments first selected for service denuded the others, and these, when their turn came to follow, had to be hurriedly filled up by men drawn from all parts, who neither knew each other nor the officers set over them. Moreover, the depôts consisting almost entirely of recruits are liable to become nurseries of military crime.

The idea of the linked battalion was to institute a ready means of recruiting the battalions when abroad; the principle of the arrangement being that one of the linked battalions should always remain at home, recruited up to a fair strength, in order that it might act as the nursery or depôt of its fellow-corps abroad. Under the complete war organisation on the linked battalion system, a regiment was to consist of three battalions, viz. two battalions of the line, the third being the brigade centre, or depôt. With the roster in proper working order, one line battalion would be abroad, one at home; the brigade depôt to consist of 280 non-commissioned officers and men. The home battalion was intended to supply the affiliated battalion abroad with recruits, drawing in its own turn men from the depôt. This in itself was an undesirable arrangement, fraught with inconvenience. It converted the home battalion into a drill school for the battalion abroad. The officers of the home battalion pursued the labour of Sisyphus; they were disgusted at being unable to turn their efforts to useful account in forming their own regiments, as each batch of recruits, as it became efficient, was passed into the foreign regiment. There were other inconveniences which we will illustrate by a case in point, omitting the names of the regiments. A battalion at Gibraltar was composed of fairly old soldiers; its linked corps at home was a peculiarly young regiment, having 500 men under two years' service in the ranks. In a draft sent to the battalion at Gibraltar, the sergeants from the battalion at home, who, of course, under the present system, carried their rank with them on transfer, superseded all the lance sergeants and nearly all the corporals in the regiment at Gibraltar. That is to say, that in point of service they were junior to men over whose heads they were then passed. If both battalions of a linked regiment are abroad, the brigade depôt must supply the recruits for both. The system, if pur-

sued, must kill *esprit de corps*. We believe that this would be a grievous error, for the volunteer soldier cannot be treated as a mere machine. On this subject, the words of H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, before Colonel Stanley's Committee, are worthy of note :—

‘The real fact is that in a volunteer army the battalion is the family. The men wish to belong to a family; they have no home of their own, and their home is the battalion to which they belong; this is the link which brings men to enlist in the army, and if you break that link you have nothing to take its place.’

Esprit de corps has been termed a form of sentiment; but it is mainly the quality of mind which enables soldiers to feel in masses and to move in masses; it is what gives an army its power over a population which outnumbers it many times. The joint action of the units of an army may be caused by the will of the commander; but the feeling of pride in, and sympathy with, each other, the mutual support and assistance which soldiers afford each other when in difficulties, without a direct word of command, result from *esprit de corps*. No efficient army could exist without it. It is a quality which should be fostered rather than discountenanced. The facility with which an army can be handled in masses is in proportion to the perfection of its subdivision into unity, and in order to perfect the discipline and the power both of manœuvring and of resistance in a regiment, or in a company, it is essential that it should be permeated by *esprit de corps*. This has not always been sufficiently regarded, either in the linking together of regiments, of whom so many possess traditions of exploits shared in common with other regiments, or in the alterations of dress which have been so numerous in late years; and we fear that in the rearrangement of linked regiments under the recommendations of Colonel Stanley's Committee, unless great discrimination be used, the same absence of consideration in this matter may prevail.

Although there are objections to the system on which the brigade dépôts and linked battalions have been carried on, there is, both as a means of encouraging *esprit de corps* and for other reasons, an advantage in localising the regiment to a particular county. The old four-company dépôt system, inaugurated by the late Duke of Wellington, possessed some peculiar merits: it was popular; it supplied battalions with recruits trained in regimental ways and imbued with regimental ideas. The advantage of the four-company dépôt system was that it acted as a regimental nursery for the regiment, and contained a sufficient number of older soldiers to enable the recruits

to be trained ; it afforded a place for its records when on service, and a *point d'appui* for officers and soldiers who returned home. The germ of good which they contained might be utilised in amending the present system.

The auxiliary, or, as possibly they might be more appropriately termed, the reserve, forces consist of the militia, the volunteers or yeomanry, the army reserve, and the militia reserve ; and it is essential to the creation of a homogeneous army that these should be all brought into systematic connexion with the regiments forming the regular army. We enunciated in 1871 the principle that the militia should form the nursery of the line, and that the reserve should receive the soldier at the termination of his service with the ranks ; the three, viz. militia, line battalion, and reserve, being linked together in one homogeneous body. This was the view held by the late Lord Sandhurst, an officer whose early death deprived the country of a sagacious and far-seeing army reformer. Lord Sandhurst's counsels did not then prevail. We believe that the period has now arrived when the nation will at last adopt most of the changes that he advocated. A regiment made up at a short notice to a full war complement, to proceed on active service, requires, not recruits, but trained soldiers. If these are obtained by volunteers from other regiments, the contributing regiments are seriously injured. Hence the principles to be kept in view in a fusion of the auxiliary forces with the line are, that the arrangements should provide an efficient reserve to be available to be called upon in the case of every war, whether great or small. The present system of mobilisation is a mere haphazard system. On mobilisation, the reserve men who are paid in any particular district join a regiment which happens to be quartered at that moment in a certain barrack in the neighbourhood. It is therefore a mere matter of chance which regiment a reserve man joins ; and his chance of joining his old regiment is infinitesimally small. The reserve man in a strange regiment is not worth half what he would be in his old one. He can have no *esprit de corps* for his new regiment, and no one in it knows or cares anything about him. A list ought to be kept at every regimental dépôt of all reserve men who have served in that regiment, with their addresses and the district in which they draw their reserve pay. These lists should be corrected every quarter. The man's arms and kit should be ready for him at the dépôt ; and on mobilisation he should receive a warrant from the officer who pays him his reserve pay to proceed to his own dépôt. Thus regiments might be mobilised separately, or the

men might be called up by their number of years of service. The reserve men at present think they are 'pensioners;' they must learn that they are merely 'soldiers on furlough;' and if necessary their retaining fee must be raised and their families provided for when embodied. They should also be called out annually for training. Such a system would help to foster the traditions of old corps, as well as the *esprit de corps* of the regiments. It would add to the cost; but the importance of creating an army system capable of adjustment to the necessities occasioned by our frequent small wars without dislocating the whole machine would amply justify the extra outlay.

The linked battalion system, as at present worked, should cease, but the several regiments should remain in battalions attached to localities as at present. A militia regiment should be made the second battalion to every battalion of the line; and where a regiment consisted of two battalions, there should be a militia regiment attached to each battalion. Thus there would be two militia battalions attached to each two battalions of the line. To this should be linked one battalion of volunteers. This unit, viz., two line battalions, two militia regiments, and a regiment of volunteers, should form the complete regiment, to which should be attached the army reserve men and militia reserve men of the district. To this reserve we would add a volunteer reserve to be created. This should be composed of men under thirty years of age who had served a certain number of years with the volunteers, and who were recommended by their own commanding officer, and reported thoroughly efficient soldiers by the inspecting officer. These men should receive the same amount of pay as the army reserve men, and do as much drill as may be thought necessary, besides attending the volunteer camps and the annual inspection of the regiment. We believe that such a force might be raised, and that it would be most efficient if called out for active service; and at other times would be more under the supervision of the military authorities than the army reserve proper has hitherto been. Volunteer regiments would thus, moreover, be strengthened by having in their ranks a certain number of absolutely reliable men, and they would be more bound up with the system of army organisation than at present.

Each militia battalion, including the reserve, should be made up to 1,200 men, out of which the reserve should always form a force of 400 men. For instance, if the army reserve amounted to 100, then the militia and volunteer reserves should be made up to 300. These reserves should be available to be called on for active service with the regiment to which

they belong in any case of war. The army reserve should be liable to be called up in the first instance, and after them the other reserves. It is of the first importance that the reserves should be effective. It is notorious that, on the late occasion of calling out the reserve, a large number of men were found to be inefficient from various causes, and consequently a large deduction had to be made from the nominal list for those actually efficient. There will always be the liability of finding a certain number of men inefficient when called out, and this liability can only be reduced to its lowest value by careful inspection, and by the officer in charge keeping himself personally acquainted with the condition and location of every reserve man, and every man not found efficient and ready to serve should be scrupulously weeded out. The reserve should thus be considered an integral part of the regiment, although only coming under the immediate eye of the commanding officer once a year. Fully trained men might be allowed leave of absence subject to the approval of the Commander-in-Chief. We believe that for the militia reserve especially there would be an advantage in allowing men who are known to be thoroughly efficient to be exempt from attending the whole of the annual drill, and such exemption would make the service less unpopular with farmers and other employers of labour.

Recruits would be best trained at the head-quarters of the regiment; but when the regiment is abroad they must be trained at a *depôt*, and they cannot be adequately trained unless in company with a proportion of older soldiers. An efficient *depôt* for training recruits could be obtained by a four-company *depôt* created by making up each line battalion to ten companies, of which two would be *depôt* companies, occupying what are now the brigade *depôt* barracks, with the permanent staff of the militia. This would bring the line regiments into permanently close relations with their affiliated militia regiments and the reserves attached thereto. But very few, if any, of the brigade *depôt* barracks are at present of a size to admit of these enlarged *depôts*, and those selected for the purpose will require additional buildings; moreover, to render this system effective, it would probably be necessary to keep a larger number of regiments at their full strength than has been the case hitherto.

As an alternative and more economical plan the formation of training *depôts* for the recruits of all regiments abroad has been suggested, we understand, by Sir Daniel Lysons. There would be attached to each militia battalion one captain with one or more staff sergeants to recruit for the line battalions,

and the captain would retain the records of his own battalion while it is abroad. When the battalion is at home, recruiting would also be carried on at the head-quarters of the regiment, and all the recruits would be trained there. Each regiment would have nine companies. The ninth company would act as a *depôt* company. For regiments abroad all recruiting would be carried on at the head-quarters of the linked militia regiment. But inasmuch as the head-quarters of the militia battalion would not afford an adequate school for training the recruits of the regiment and to provide some machinery by which at any time vacancies in regiments abroad could be filled up rapidly with trained recruits, provisional battalions would be formed (at convenient places, such as Parkhurst, Warley, &c.), varying in strength according to requirements. The staff of these provisional battalions would be permanent; the remaining officers, non-commissioned officers, and percentage of old soldiers would be furnished from regiments of the line on foreign service. These battalions would act as reservoirs of men to fill up corps on foreign service. For instance, when the regiment went abroad, the ninth company would receive the untrained recruits at head-quarters, all the men unfit to go abroad, and all the men whose time would expire during the following year, and would proceed to one or other of these provisional battalions. All recruits raised for the regiment whilst abroad would be attached to this company. The presence, in the several companies, of the time-expired men, and of such other older soldiers who did not accompany the regiment abroad, would give a tone to the provisional battalion which it would be difficult to give if made up of recruits alone. This plan would provide a reserve from which young soldiers could be drawn and sent to any regiment requiring them in case of war without injuring the working army in time of peace; it would maintain the identity and *esprit de corps* of regiments; it would leave a large recruiting staff throughout the country; but it would not create so close a relationship between the line and militia and the army and militia reserve as the above-suggested plan of making the affiliated local centre the permanent *depôt* of the line battalions.

In proportion as officers of companies become more professional, their responsibilities should be increased. The training of recruits attached to their companies, the award of minor punishments, the settling of details such as fatigues and so forth, should be left to them instead of, as hitherto, to the adjutant or serjeant-major. In the cavalry the unit of a

troop is too small for practical work. It is a barrack not a field unit. A captain who leads a squadron in the field knows only half the men and horses, viz., those of his own troop. A captain should command a squadron, drill his own men and horses, instead of leaving it to the Adjutant and Riding Master, and maintain all minor discipline. Inspections from head-quarters have been too much matters of ceremony and parade; they should be searching, making enquiry into every detail and unsparingly exposing every defect.

We would here add one word upon the auxiliary forces. The militia and also the volunteers may be considered to be sufficiently disciplined to form an imposing element in the nation's military power in the event of invasion. As regards the volunteers, at a recent review of volunteer corps in the district commanded by General Willis, that officer is reported to have expressed his confidence in the fitness of the troops after a few weeks' steady drill in barracks and camp; and this opinion may be fairly applied to the volunteer rank and file as a whole. They all know at least the rudiments of drill; they have learned to use their weapons with a precision which no foe-man would be likely to despise; and they are accustomed both in civil and military life to habits of obedience. In physique they are far superior to their regular comrades, while taken man for man their power of endurance is certainly greater. The intelligence of the volunteers is greater than that of the regulars, and would make the work of the barrack-yard easy and rapid, and enable the volunteer to apply in actual fight, and to the best purpose, the principles the barrack-yard teaches. But both the militia and volunteers possess one element of weakness in common. A regiment does not consist of the rank and file only. It should be made up of men who know how to obey, and also of men who know how to command. Here we touch the chief weakness of the force, a weakness so alarming in its proportions, and so disastrous in its possible results, that too much attention cannot be called to it. There are many well-trained officers in both services, but the average officer, whether militia or volunteer, does not possess that training which his position requires. It is an axiom that, the less trained the rank and file, the better trained should the officer be. And every advance in efficiency made by the rank and file must render more conspicuous the want of higher education in the officers, and more keen the perception of that want by those under their command; and we say unhesitatingly that if the militia and the volunteers are to become an integral part of our organisation, as we hope will be the case, steps

must be taken to improve the education and training of the officers. With the militia this is comparatively easy, because when the battalions of the line are linked with militia regiments in the manner suggested, it would be but a small step to arrange for an interchange of officers upon a defined basis, and such interchange would bring the militia and the united line regiments into closer union and harmony. With the volunteers the question is more complicated; but we would suggest that the way out of the difficulty would be in the elevation of the volunteer officer, by requiring from him higher technical qualifications, first having given him all needful facilities for their acquisition, by facilitating his service with line regiments, and by abolishing every distinction which reflects upon him unfavourably.

4. In the other material change which was made in army organisation during Lord Cardwell's administration, he was not happily advised. This was gathering the supply services into a department termed the Control Department.

In the Franco-Prussian War the contrast was exhibited of two systems of administering the supplies of an army: one, the French, through the Intendance, which is a branch separated from the army proper; the other, the Prussian, through the Etappen system, which exists in intimate connexion with the staff of the general officer commanding the army, as described by us on a former occasion. The French system failed; the Prussian succeeded. The arrangement adopted by Lord Cardwell for gathering the supply departments of the army into the Department of Control followed the French Intendance rather than the Prussian system, and retained some features of the previous organisation, which had a tendency to prevent that perfect concert with the military departments which is essential to the success of an army in the field. What may be termed the supply departments, thus dealt with, performed the following duties. In the first place, they purchased and issued the bread, meat, forage, and fuel, i.e. consumable stores, which are contracted for from local dealers, delivered periodically, and issued in regulated quantities; they kept in store a certain quantity of other provisions to meet emergencies. In the second place, they held and issued the stores for barrack use or for lodging the troops, such as tents, blankets, beds, utensils, &c., none of which are, as a rule, purchased on the spot, but are obtained from a central dépôt. They further allotted the barrack accommodation, which is a matter of strict regulation, according to cubic space, and provided for scavenging, lighting, &c., and other incidental

barrack services. Thirdly, they held and issued articles of equipment and clothing, which are not purchased on the spot, but obtained from central stores or from the manufacturing departments. Fourthly, they held and issued arms and ammunition, which are also issued from central depôts or from the manufacturing departments. Fifthly, they provided transport for the troops. Sixthly, they provided the money and rendered the accounts to the War Office; but this duty has been transferred to the Army Pay Department.

The Surveyor-General of Ordnance, who had general charge of the supply departments, had other important duties not in immediate connexion with the troops. Under his directions the general stores maintained as a provision in case of emergencies, of clothing or of equipment for the field, of barrack furniture, of arms and ammunition, were purchased; and under his directions, also, the great manufacturing departments were carried on. The stores thus purchased or manufactured in the gross were detailed by the department for transmission to the several garrisons or stations for local use, and the store accounts rendered from the stations, showing the local appropriation of stores, were examined and checked by the department.

The Control Department, as devised by Lord Cardwell, was based upon that principle of distrust which, before 1855, governed the Treasury and the Ordnance in their relations to the line and cavalry—viz. the principle imported from the Treasury-chest regulations—that every general officer in command is to be accompanied by a controller of army expenditure, appointed by the civilian as distinguished from the military element in army administration, who is to look after him and to control the expenditure. The endeavour to maintain a personal check over the military exercised by *quasi* civilian officers holding an allegiance to the Secretary of State for War, distinct from the allegiance to the military officer in command, produced the chaos which prevailed at the early amalgamation of the military departments after the Crimean War, and its perpetuation in the Control Department necessarily prevented that simplicity and unity which lie at the root of military efficiency. Lord Cranbrook found that difficulties had arisen, and during his administration the changes introduced by Lord Cardwell were considerably modified; a division was made between the administration of the ordnance or military stores and the commissariat and barrack stores and supplies. The *personnel* was placed under the Commander-in-Chief. And Lord Cranbrook, moreover, created the Army Pay Depart-

ment as a separate branch under the War Office. But further changes in the same direction are essential in order to secure efficiency, unity, and economy. Although the *personnel* of the Supply Department was placed by Lord Cranbrook under the Commander-in-Chief, the executive duties in connexion with the troops, such as the issue of food, fuel, forage, equipments, practice ammunition, the allotment of barrack accommodation, &c., continued to be performed directly under the War Office. But these are all matters subject to distinct regulations; and, if the regulations are clear and the system of account and audit efficient, there is no reason why all direct executive functions should not be vested in the military department and under the general officer in command of the district; whilst the Surveyor-General of Ordnance would exercise his control by means of the audit. In the case of extraordinary expenditure—i.e. expenditure not contemplated in the regulations—the commanding officer is the only person who should be held responsible; and the more he is made to feel a real responsibility in respect of the supply of his troops, the better generals shall we produce.

It is manifestly proper that a Parliamentary officer, such as is the Surveyor-General of Ordnance, should hold a general control over the expenditure in the manufacturing departments, as well as the control of purchases of stores, of the regulations affecting their issue to the troops, and over the audit of the local store accounts. But it is equally necessary and desirable, from an administrative point of view, that after the stores have been forwarded to the district or station and transferred to the military for the use of the troops, the local expenditure and administration should be entirely in the hands of the executive military *personnel*, under the commanding officer in charge of troops, who should be held responsible for the due custody and consumption, according to regulations, of the stores and supplies in his command. This responsibility should be enforced by an efficient form of accounts, by periodical examination and stock-taking, through the agency of local boards, and by the employment, if need were, of inspectors occasionally sent down from the office of the Surveyor-General of Ordnance. Under the old regulations of the service, the stores for an army in the field were classed under Quartermaster-General's stores and Adjutant-General's stores: the former consisting of tents, clothing, and matters affecting the well-being of the troops; the latter of arms or articles proper for fighting purposes. In the Indian service there is a division between the ordnance or military stores and the commissariat stores, and,

as already mentioned, Lord Cranbrook has practically restored this division in the British service. The Quartermaster-General's department is specially adapted to take up the duties of supervising the local provision of the supplies affecting the well-being of the troops, as contradistinguished from ordnance or military stores, as well as the distribution of barrack accommodation and the arrangements for transport. It would have been absurd to retain the Quartermaster-General's Department in the face of the existence of the Control Department, unless for the anomaly that the Control Department was supposed to be a check over the fighting corps. This bar to unity of administration having been removed, the Quartermaster-General's Department becomes the proper department for supervising the supply of this class of stores in immediate connexion with the troops. Under such an arrangement the Surveyor-General of Ordnance would retain that part of his functions which relates to fixing the proportion of stores to be maintained at the several stations for use or for reserves, of approving of the estimates for stores, and of seeing to the purchase of such stores as have to be provided by general contracts, and received at the Tower or at Woolwich, to be thence forwarded to the several stations. But the purchase of all stores locally would be made under the immediate authority of the general officer commanding, subject to regulations. The Surveyor-General of Ordnance would audit the expenditure for purchases made locally, and he would audit the expenditure or user of all stores in the custody of the military departments. He would also control directly the manufacturing departments at the Arsenal at Woolwich; but where there are local workshops for the repair of stores at a station, they ought to be entirely under the local authorities. This arrangement would be economical. It should lead to a reduction of expenditure on *personnel* and to an economy in the consumption of the stores in consequence of their responsible supervision by officers thoroughly conversant with the real wants of the soldier. But the arrangement would possess far greater merits than those of economy. Whilst it would retain the Surveyor-General of Ordnance in his true position, as Parliamentary and therefore civilian officer, of controller of the supplies and *matériel* of the army, it would place the executive duties relating to supply, which are in immediate connexion with the troops, directly under the commanding officer. It would thus educate our general officers in the daily wants and difficulties of supply, and develope in them that administrative capacity which, in the majority of cases, is more necessary to success in war than mere fighting qualities.

We have hitherto been dealing with the units which compose the army. In the next step towards the formation of an army, viz. that of bringing these units into a united mass, gradual progress has been made. Much of the winter trouble in the Crimean War was due to the fact that the staff of the army was placed suddenly in the most trying position, without qualification by previous training or knowledge for the discharge of their duties; and it could not be expected that gay young soldiers, of whom not many had any experience of service or any training in what are the duties of a staff in the field, could at once become, under the enemy's fire, wary, indefatigable, vigilant—the eyes, ears, and arms of their general. And so far back as 1855 the Prince Consort proposed a permanent organisation by brigades and divisions, which would include every branch of the service. He laid down the axiom

‘that each division and each brigade ought to have its staff, commissariat, medical department, ambulance, and baggage train attached to it. That by keeping these commands and appointments filled up could we alone get the means of judging of the fitness of men for command, and give them the means of fitting themselves for it. The divisions ought to be located in accordance with a comprehensive view of the exigencies of the country at home and abroad, and with reference to the duties which they may be called upon to perform. Camps of evolution, in which the troops should be concentrated and drilled together during a portion of the year, should at the same time be formed.’

Although the method of educating our officers for important commands has not been fully developed, we have had instances of genius asserting itself under difficult circumstances: Sir Garnet Wolseley in Ashantee, Sir F. Roberts in Afghanistan, exhibited the finest qualities of a soldier. Sir F. Roberts's successful march from Cabul to Candahar across an enemy's country, without a base of operations, is one of the best instances which could be adduced of the advantages to be obtained by placing the full control of the administration of the various army corps under general officers such as we advocate. Sir Donald Stewart and Sir F. Roberts had moulded the army into the shape in which it commanded success by the careful supervision of every detail of the arrangements for the march. Of course our necessities and organisation would not often permit of whole army corps being moved at once. Nor can British army corps have that permanent territorial character which attaches to the organisation of the same name in Prussia. The necessities of our empire compel us to move our troops according to the unit of the regiment; and for the artillery

the battery. But army corps, although composed of units liable to shift, may usefully exist for training our officers and men in the highest knowledge of their profession. It is only by creating and maintaining in time of peace army corps under responsible general officers, that we shall be able to educate our generals in the effective preservation and government of the army in war.

One of the causes why general officers have not been entrusted with the responsible administration of all matters in their command arises from the centralised system of the War Office and Horse Guards. This system has been developed by peculiar circumstances, and has been inimical to entrusting the general officers with responsible duties. After the great war the Duke of Wellington held the opinion that the nation was tired of the expense of the army, and that soldiers should be as much as possible concealed from public view. He scattered the regiments about the country, and it was not till the Crimean War that the principle of large camps was adopted. But during the forty years of peace the departments of the Ordnance, of the Secretary at War, and the Treasury-chest officers had been consistently educated in a spirit of distrust of the military element; and they carried this distrust into the new system. If a War Minister in 1855 had found a *tabula rasa*, it would have been an act of insanity to create the system which has grown up. He would not have placed each chief departmental officer at every station in direct communication with the War Office, but he would have made the general officer of the district paramount, and constituted him the focus in each district to which all questions relating to *personnel*, *matériel*, or finance would converge. By slow degrees the principle of giving additional duties to general officers has been gradually developed, but it has not yet progressed sufficiently far. The general officer should be made fully responsible for every matter concerning the troops in his command; that is to say, in the location and duties of the troops, in their lodging and provisioning, and in the care of the stores, whether for use or reserves. In fact, the general officer should be the local epitome of the War Office as concentrated in Pall Mall. By placing this fuller responsibility on the military executive, the War Office would be decentralised and confined to its proper functions of approving in such detail as it sees fit the original estimate for expenditure, whether of money, of stores, or of works; and of auditing the expenditure when made. It is beyond the scope of this article to enter further into the details involved in this question of army organisation; we

would only add that in connexion with the present system of centralisation there is one point of detail which has grown out of it, and which, although apparently a small matter, is one of paramount importance. We mean that of the numerous returns required from all regimental and staff officers. In an army there should be no desk work which cannot be carried on in time of war as well as in time of peace; and yet it would be impossible for regiments on war service, or for staff officers, to keep up the returns which are now continually required in time of peace. We understood that a committee had been appointed a short time ago, to revise the forms; in such an inquiry the question to be asked as to each form is not—Is it useful? but—Can it be dispensed with?

The changes which have been made in recent years in our army organisation are all so many steps towards bringing the army into harmony with the changes which have taken place in the institutions of the country, and towards making it an efficient instrument in the altered conditions of warfare. It is always more difficult to rearrange existing institutions than to create a new system. The reformers, if members of the old institution, whilst they possess a thorough knowledge of its working, find it difficult to remove themselves out of the influence of the traditions of the past, and place themselves on a standpoint where they would be unfettered by their prepossessions or prejudices: while outside reformers can with difficulty acquire the necessary knowledge, and they meet strong opposition from vested interests. The alterations of the last twenty years have fixed the general line in which army reform must progress. Many abuses have been removed, we trust never to return, but some of these abuses possessed compensating advantages, which the new system has not in all cases replaced. We have endeavoured, in our brief summary, to show rather where improvement is to be sought for than to criticise the past. And in judging of the efforts of army reformers from the days of Lord Grey to Lord Cardwell, it is more just to weigh the difficulties which they had to encounter, than to criticise the shortcomings of their achievements. Each step of forward progress has rendered the task of reform more easy for their successors, and we trust that Mr. Childers will now place the crown on the edifice of army reform.

ART. VIII.—*A Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (A.D. 1450—1878), by eminent Writers, English and Foreign, with Illustrations and Woodcuts. Edited by GEORGE GROVE, D.C.L. London: 1878–1880. (In progress.)

WHAT should be the especial characteristics of a good dictionary? In the case of the class of publications to which the term is most popularly applied, dictionaries of a language or of the technical terms of a special science, the problem is, in one sense, a comparatively simple one. Scholarship and accuracy in the expression of it are alone demanded in such works, in which the literary element can hardly be said to exist, and which, though involving much (too often) thankless and unrecognised drudgery on the part of their authors, may be and have been successfully accomplished by individual labour. But a dictionary which is not confined to the mere investigation of the meaning and derivation of words or technical terms—one which professes to give, with reasonable amplitude, information on all the topics connected with a large subject—stands on different and on rather peculiar ground. Accuracy and research are as much demanded as in the other case; but with these must be combined literary culture and style, such as will present its varied subject-matter in an agreeable form to the reader. Yet it can hardly, like most other literary works, be the production of one mind or of one pen. The information required to elucidate critically and historically even a single art, for example, can only be adequately supplied by the division of labour among a staff of contributors. But it is not enough that every contributor should treat his own subject adequately after his own manner. From the literary critic's point of view the book, the work of many authors, must nevertheless have consistency, coherence, and proportion as a whole. An encyclopædia, which deals with every variety of subject, may perhaps be regarded as a collection of essays by various authors, though even here proportion is requisite. A dictionary dealing with one subject, however wide in its scope, cannot be so regarded. Individual preferences or prejudices must be subordinated to the true end of giving a just and well-balanced view of the subject as a whole; undue prolixity on a favourite theme must be curtailed; over-luxuriant rhetoric must be judiciously pruned; all advocacy of the special views of a clique or of an individual critic must be repressed. The object of a dictionary such as this is not to record the accidental opinions of the hour, but to

give an unbiassed *résumé* of the essentials of the subject treated of, in which the various proclivities and amiable weaknesses of special contributors are marshalled into form and order by the firm hand of a judicious and impartial editor.

That such an ideal standard of dictionary-making may be reached under favourable circumstances, we have no doubt; that it has ever been attained, we will not undertake to assert, still less that it is attained in the important work before us. But on this head it may be said at once that those who know how much other work has been done at the same time by its energetic editor, will be disposed rather to wonder that he could have carried through such an enterprise at all, than that it should display some need of more systematic and comprehensive editing. Under such circumstances an editor is also very much beholden to his contributors. Dictionary articles are seldom or never really remunerative, as literary work goes; the labour is practically honorary, and the editor is under almost a necessity to keep his contributors in good humour, to

‘Speak them fair,
An’ stroke them canny wi’ the hair;’

and nothing sets your contributor's back up more than pruning and condensing him. Thus much in palliation of some defects in the Dictionary as a whole which cannot be overlooked; but the fact of the publication of such a work in itself marks an important and gratifying step in the history of musical culture in England. Our musical literature is restricted in quantity, and mostly very second-rate in quality, in every department; nor would it seem that there has been any demand for better fare until very recently. The leading theoretical treatises on composition in other languages have been translated for the use of students, but not of course popularised, nor are they intended for general readers. It is only recently that there has sprung up among the more cultured section of English men and women a general interest in music and a wish to hear it with the understanding (up to a certain point at least) as well as with the spirit. And with this increased interest in the art has arisen the desire for more information about it, and the conclusion that such information is not very accessible, except in technical works mostly occupied with some special branch of the art. To quote the editor's preface:—

‘There is no one work in English from which an intelligent inquirer can learn, in small compass and in untechnical language, what is meant by a symphony or sonata, a fugue, a stretto, a coda, or any other of the terms which necessarily occur in every description or analysis of a

concert or a piece of music, from which he can gain a readable and succinct account of the history of the various branches of the art, or of the rise and progress of the pianoforte and other instruments, or the main facts and characteristics of the lives of eminent or representative musicians, or the circumstances attending the origin of their chief works.'

It is to supply this want that Mr. Grove's Dictionary has been projected; and the mere fact that it can be worth while to bring out a Dictionary of Music on so large a scale, professing to give at least adequate general information on every topic in connexion with the art, is in itself a practical proof of the greatly increased interest in music in English society, as well as a favourable augury for the further increase of such interest by the supply of better opportunities of gaining information on subjects connected with music.

These various subjects, as dealt with in a dictionary, may be approximately classified under the heads of biographical notices of eminent musicians, articles on the theory and æsthetics of music, those on the history of the development of various branches of composition, those which give information as to the mechanism and handling of musical instruments, and those which consist merely of short explanations of terms used in music. The biographical notices form to the generality of readers the most interesting portion of such a dictionary. Taking a glance first, then, at this portion of the new Dictionary, we are struck by the excellence of some of the biographical articles taken separately, and equally so by their want of proportion when taken collectively and as parts of a whole work. The mere statement of the space occupied respectively by some of the principal biographical essays will indicate what a curious disproportion there is in this particular. We have a sensible but very brief and concise article on Bach, occupying five pages; a more interesting but still somewhat reticent account of Handel, occupying ten pages; a very full and admirable article on Beethoven, occupying nearly fifty pages; a good one on Mozart, of considerable length; and an article on Mendelssohn, including nearly all that can be said about him in the way of critical, biographical, and anecdotal comment, and reaching to sixty pages. Five pages for Bach, and sixty for Mendelssohn! There can be but one of two conclusions—either Bach has received most inadequate attention, or the article on Mendelssohn occupies a space utterly disproportionate to the scale of the Dictionary, and should have been published as a separate biographical sketch. The disproportion would be remarkable even in the case of two.

composers of equal importance ; but what is the fact ? Though nothing can be more absurd and uncritical than the systematic depreciation of Mendelssohn by the partisans of Schumann and Wagner, yet it cannot be questioned by any thoughtful critic in the present day that Mendelssohn's genius, and the importance of his position in the history of the art, were by his own generation very much exaggerated. Partly owing to an unquestionable and very fascinating novelty of style, distinctly his own, partly owing no doubt to his generally charming manners and disposition, Mendelssohn was the victim, during his lifetime and for some little time after his death, of the same kind of romantic homage which Byron received during the period of his popularity. We say advisedly the 'victim,' because for such over-doses of popularity there is always a corresponding and almost necessarily an unjust reaction. The reaction has for some time set in, in the case of Mendelssohn, so decidedly that the rising generation of amateurs would be perfectly astonished if they could hear how the composer was spoken of, fifteen or twenty years ago, as one who combined in his own genius all the best qualities of his great predecessors in the art. Such an opinion is now only to be met with in the musical society of cathedral towns and other such fossiliferous strata. But the part played by Mendelssohn in Mr. Grove's Dictionary is as if a contributor to a literary dictionary were to treat of Byron from the critical standpoint of the period when he was extolled as the greatest of poets, and when romantic girls wore his portrait in their lockets. It is true that in the concluding words of the article Mr. Grove (for it is an editorial contribution) does indicate a sense that Mendelssohn was not one of those who had touched the highest point in the art, but only in a rather vague general tone, by no means sufficient to counterbalance the effect of the whole article, which certainly is to stereotype a view of Mendelssohn that is in reality out of date. Anecdotes of him and of his jokes, always good-natured but often really very small ones, are multiplied to excess. If instead of all this mass of anecdote, the interest of which is already nearly gone, and all this but little regulated enthusiasm, an attempt had been made, in a briefer, more considerate, and more concentrated critical essay, to hold the scales for a true balance of Mendelssohn's genius, to show (what some people have already forgotten) in what the real beauty of his art consists, and (what many people have never known) wherein lie its shortcomings in expression and constructive power, such an essay might have done real service in reconciling conflicting prejudices and

putting on record a just and sober estimate of a composer who has been the object of so much unjust depreciation on one side and exaggerated enthusiasm on the other. As it is, the article, however pleasantly written (and what Mr. Grove writes seldom or never lacks that quality), is, from a critical point of view, a drag upon the book, and is, as we have observed, already out of date. Turn on the other hand to Bach, and note what a contrast between what might have been expected and what is given. The Bach article, by Herr Maczewski, Concert Director at Kaiserslautern, is within its limits a very well-written one, clearly expressed and arranged, and free from sentiment or enthusiasm. But if so large a space could be afforded for other biographies, how very inadequate is this concise treatment of Bach, in some respects the greatest name in music! No attempt is made at a critical estimate of his powers and of his influence on succeeding composers, no attempt to discriminate how far the modern *cultus* of his works is just and reasonable, or how far based on mere fashion; a matter in regard to which the English musical public want information, and might by some thoughtful and full criticism have been much instructed and benefited. The subject is in fact one of the most weighty and important which a musical Dictionary could deal with, and some pages might certainly have been far better employed in going fully into it than in recording social anecdotes of Mendelssohn. When the Dictionary reaches a second edition, the subject of Bach ought to be entirely reconsidered, and treated with the fulness and minuteness of criticism which it calls for, and which is quite wanting in this brief synopsis.

The article on Handel, written in a very rambling manner, is more full than that on Bach, and contains some just criticism, though we cannot but think that, with all the mass of easily available material within reach, something more might have been done to convey a vivid and living impression of the composer who was so great a figure in the English world of music, the rather as the best accounts of him, though, as we have said, easily accessible to literary students, are not so to the reading public generally, and Schœlcher's 'Life' is too full of absurdities to be recommended for special study. It would have been well if some one had done for Handel what the editor has done for Beethoven in his article, which is admirable, and is really the only good and accurate account of Beethoven, both as to facts and criticism, in our language, and may have served to give to many who have all their lives known and loved Beethoven's genius their first distinct and

coherent idea of the great instrumental poet's real character and personality. No one can complain of this article for undue length, for the genius of Beethoven is so colossal, the place he fills in modern music so entirely above that of any other composer, that no justice could have been done to the subject in a brief article. The essay gives evidence of most laborious preparation, and appears to be as complete as such an article could possibly be made, containing a great amount of information in regard to the production of many of the composer's works, and giving sufficient of anecdote and personal traits to bring his figure vividly before us, though without bestowing too much space on this part of the subject. It would have been impossible to make a lifelike portraiture of Beethoven without giving some few of the curious stories that are on record of his grotesque eccentricities, but the author has shown a commendable judgment in keeping this part of his subject within bounds. Other anecdotes and sayings of a more serious nature are welcome, revealing as they do some additional aspects of a character which, some superficial uncouthness apart, appears greater the more we know of it. The critical remarks on Beethoven's genius are very true, just, and often eloquent, and in the main keep fairly clear of that tendency to rhapsodise which is the besetting sin of writers on music. We can hardly see the necessity, and we rather question the good taste, of placing on record, in very medical language, the results of the post-mortem examination of the cage in which the spirit of Beethoven had been pent; one would rather feel with the speaker in the epilogue to 'Fifine:'

'Never mind, hie away from this old house,
Every crumbling brick embrowned with sin and shame.
Quick, in its corner ere certain shapes arouse;'

but the second line could apply to Beethoven only in the theologian's sense, certainly. We had also an impression that the article would be the better for some rearrangement of its matter, so as to keep the historical and critical portions each more separate and continuous; at present it is somewhat excursive in this respect. This could very easily be done in another edition by the transposition of paragraphs, with hardly the alteration of more than a few words. As it is, however, the essay reflects very high credit on its author, and the volume containing it is worth possessing on that account alone.

The biographies of Mozart and Haydn, contributed by Herr C. F. Pohl, librarian of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde at

Vienna, are pitched in a much lower and more practical key, and may both be characterised as very useful and sensibly written articles, containing full and detailed information, much of which is new to most English readers. Indeed, of Haydn so little is known now by English amateurs that, apart from his music, he is but a name to most of us, although he spent a long time in England amid great popularity; and the article in which his character and career are described is, therefore, a specially useful contribution to English musical literature. Mozart has already been the subject, as has before been observed in these pages, of the only fairly good musical biography in our language, that by Holmes. But the writer of the Dictionary memoir has, whether intentionally or not, escaped a good deal from repeating minor anecdotes and facts already well known to English musical readers, and has, on the other hand, supplied points and anecdotes which are new. Both the articles are written in the plain unpretending matter-of-fact style which we hold to be the most suitable for a dictionary, and the writer never intrudes his own reflections unnecessarily on his readers. At the same time it must be confessed that something more of thoughtful analysis of the genius of the two composers, so intimately associated in the history of the art, would have been a valuable addition to these otherwise praiseworthy articles. The author does not intend to neglect this; but his analysis, if so it can be called, is too vague and general in its terms to be of much real value as a guide to those who wish to understand anything of the peculiar characteristics of the music of Haydn and Mozart in detail, and the differences between their manner of working. Occasionally we come across sentences which may mean a great deal, but the meaning of which is very obscurely expressed. Of Mozart, for instance—'The quintetts must all be ascribed to external influences: Mozart invariably doubled the viola instead of the cello, as Boccherini did.' What is the meaning of the first sentence of this paragraph, and what is its connexion with the second? "'Don Giovanni,' inferior perhaps to "Figaro" as regards artistic treatment, has one manifest superiority; all the moods and situations are essentially musical. There is scarcely a feeling known to humanity which is not expressed in some one of the situations or characters, male or female.' To this latter point, the essentially human interest of 'Don Giovanni,' we referred at some length in a recent article on Mozart, though we are unable to explain what a male or female situation is; but the statement that all the situations are 'essentially musical'

assumes so much, and, whether true or not, touches on such important considerations in regard to the philosophy of musical drama, that we might certainly have expected to have at least some brief indication as to what the writer considered to constitute a 'musical situation.' Returning to the less familiar subject of Haydn, it may be observed that the article upon him is illustrated by a reproduction of a *silhouette* portrait, now first engraved, and the original of which hung for a long time at the head of the composer's bed. The outline, with its sedate expression and protruding underlip, is highly characteristic,* and looks very like the portrait of the man who 'maintained a strict daily routine, and never sat down to work, or received a visit, until he was fully dressed.'

Of Haydn's strong feeling for his art an example is afforded in a remark of his own, which is quoted: 'I have only just learned in my old age how to use the wind instruments, and now that I do understand them I must leave the world.' The quantity of compositions he produced was owing to his methodical industry, and not to hasty writing. He always, he said, composed 'with care and deliberation; that alone is the way to compose works that will last, and a real *connoisseur* can see at a glance whether a score has been written with undue haste or not.' It is curious to find that he sketched his compositions at the piano, and was even, we are told, somewhat dependent on the character of the instrument, writing to Artaria the publisher, 'I was obliged to buy a new *forte-piano*, that I might compose your Clavier sonatas particularly well;' but we rather suspect that the author has drawn a wrong inference here, and that, as this letter was written in 1778, not long after the pianoforte in something like its present form had begun to come into use, what Haydn wanted was merely to become more intimately acquainted with the capabilities of the newest make of instrument. In depending upon the keyboard at all for composing

* It may here be remarked that the few portraits of composers introduced into the Dictionary are chosen with great judgment, and in all cases convey the impression of reality and of being good likenesses. They are not elaborate engravings, but merely cuts on the page, and seem to have been selected for their character for authenticity rather than from any popular acceptance which they may have enjoyed. The profile face of Handel (without his wig) is very good, and the little full-length sketch of Beethoven walking with his hands behind him, a pencil copy of which we saw in private hands many years ago, carries conviction of its authenticity in its very aspect: no one could have invented it.

he was very unlike most composers of his calibre. He was very careful in regard to the manner and form of putting together his ideas after they had been first sketched out (in this quality he was in some respects not equalled by Mozart, who often leaves gaps between his subjects, where Haydn would have drawn them together by a connecting link); and said very truly, 'That is where so many young composers fail. They string together a number of fragments, they break off almost as soon as they have begun, and so at the end the listener carries away no definite impression'—a criticism which might be studied with advantage by some composers of the present day who are not young. A further quotation in regard to the composer's general personal character and manner may be of interest here:—

'We learn from Haydn's contemporaries that he was below the middle height, with legs disproportionately short; his build substantial, but deficient in muscle. His features were tolerably regular; his expression, slightly stern in repose, invariably softened in conversation. His aquiline nose was latterly much disfigured by a polypus, and his face deeply pitted by small-pox. His complexion was very dark. His dark grey eyes beamed with benevolence, and he used to say himself, "Any one can see by the look of me that I am a good-natured sort of fellow." The impression given by his countenance and bearing was that of an earnest, dignified man, perhaps a little over-precise. Though fond of a joke, he never indulged in immoderate laughter. His broad and well-formed forehead was partly concealed by a wig with side curls and a pigtail, which he wore to the end of his days. A prominent and slightly coarse underlip, with a massive jaw, completed this singular union of so much that was attractive and repelling, intellectual and vulgar. He always considered himself an ugly man, and could not understand how so many handsome women fell in love with him; "at any rate," he used to say, "they were not tempted by my beauty," though he admitted that he liked looking at a pretty woman, and was never at a loss for a compliment. He habitually spoke in the broad Austrian dialect, but could express himself fluently in Italian, and with some difficulty in French. He studied English when in London, and in the country would often take his grammar into the woods. He was also fond of introducing English phrases into his diary. He knew enough Latin to read Fux's "*Gradus*," and to set the church services. Though he lived so long in Hungary he never learned the vernacular, which was only used by the servants among themselves, the Esterhazy family * always speaking German. His love of fun sometimes carried him away; as he remarked to Dies, "a mischievous fit comes over one sometimes that is perfectly beyond control." At the same time he was sensitive, and, when provoked by a bad return for kindness, could be very sarcastic. With all his modesty he was aware of his own merits,

* Haydn was Capellmeister to Prince Nicolaus Esterhazy.

and liked to be appreciated, but flattery he never permitted. Like a true man of genius he enjoyed honour and fame, but carefully avoided ambition. He has been often reproached with cringing to his superiors, but it should not be forgotten that a man who was in daily intercourse with people of the highest rank would have no difficulty in drawing the line between respect and subservience.* That he was quite capable of defending his dignity as an artist is proved by the following occurrence. Prince Nicolaus (the second of the name) being present at a rehearsal and expressing disapprobation, Haydn at once interposed: "Your Highness, that is my business." He was very fond of children, and they in return loved "Papa Haydn" with all their hearts. He never forgot a benefit, though his kindness to many needy relations often met with a poor return. The "chapel" looked up to him as a father, and when occasion arose he was an unwearied intercessor on their behalf with the Prince. Young men of talent found in him a generous friend, always ready to aid them with advice and substantial help. To this fact Eybler, A. Romberg, Seyfried, Weigl, and others, have borne ample testimony. His intercourse with Mozart was a striking example of his readiness to acknowledge the merits of others.'

There is indeed no pleasanter chapter in the history of musicians than the record of the generous rivalry of friendship between Haydn and Mozart, the old master and the younger and still greater aspirant, each enthusiastic in praise of the other, and each most so when the other was absent and was depreciated by third persons. In regard to the attachments of which he was the object, as implied in the above-quoted passage, it may be observed that Haydn appears to have had impressionable and romantic feelings where women were concerned, which seem quite to contradict his staid and business-like character in his art. He seems to have both felt and inspired some strong attachments during his London life, and mention is made of a short composition found among his papers with the note that it was 'by Mrs. Hodges, the loveliest woman I ever saw, and a great pianoforte player. Both words and music are hers.' And there is a postscript appended, in the hand of his latest life, 'Requiescat in pace! J. Haydn.' Is anything more known in regard to the woman whose memory seems to have kept such a hold on the composer? Her name is not in the Dictionary. She was perhaps an amateur, though the expression, 'a great

* This is rather an illogical comment of Herr Pohl's, as the precise accusation against Haydn is that he did *not* so draw the line. There seems to have been some ground for the opinion that he allowed himself to be treated in the Esterhazy establishment too much like an upper servant.

'pianist,' seems to imply the contrary. In the list of literature connected with Haydn it might have been worth while to mention the fact that a great French writer has made him a character of some prominence in her most brilliant and best known novel.

We have dwelt a little on the Haydn article for the reason aforesaid, that so little attention has been paid to this composer lately in England. A few other points in the biographical department of the Dictionary we may just touch upon briefly. Cherubini is the subject of a concise and, in the main, very judicious article by Herr Maczewski, the author of the Bach article, in whose general view of Cherubini's genius we quite concur. The author, however, makes a suggestion that will not bear investigation, in saying that Cherubini gained, from his study of the old Italian contrapuntal style, 'a proficiency in polyphonic writing in which no composer 'since his time has equalled him, unless it be Mendelssohn.' No one would have been more surprised at such a conclusion to the sentence than Mendelssohn himself. His music speaks to a far wider circle of hearers than that of Cherubini, and appeals much more to the heart of humanity, because he had what some modern critics would be disposed to call, in the language of Byron, 'the fatal gift of beauty,' which was denied to Cherubini. But polyphonic composition of the more elaborate and strict style was never Mendelssohn's strong point, as he himself well knew; he wrestled with it rather than mastered it, and his choral writing cannot in this respect be compared with that of Cherubini, who was one of the greatest masters of form and construction in music, though deficient in colour and expression. Our English composer, Sterndale Bennett, is treated at some length in an article which we believe represents what is likely to be the ultimate verdict on his genius, which is at present a bone of contention, underrated by some, overrated by others. The notice of Josquin—a name of which, in all probability, many who may open the Dictionary, or who may read these remarks, have never heard—may for that very reason be mentioned as an important item in the biographical section, and also because Josquin was the first composer who left behind him a definite reputation founded on works some of which have been preserved. Potentially he was probably a great composer, one of those 'swift souls who yearn for light,' and who have the misfortune to appear before the wings are shaped with which to make their flight. Chopin (to come from ancient to modern) is unsatisfactorily treated in a short article by a

contributor whose additions to the Dictionary are mostly by no means happy, being distinguished by violent prejudices and partialities, and by a turgid and inflated style, sometimes scarcely coming within the definition of good English. The same contributor's article on Hummel, a mere sneer at a composer whom he does not like, is a discredit to the Dictionary, and should be expunged on the first opportunity. The article on Liszt, by Mr. Hueffer, is also somewhat *ex parte*, though not more so than might be excused on the part of an ardent admirer of the composer; the importance of his compositions we consider, however, to be decidedly overrated. The author naïvely remarks that the knowledge of Liszt's music in England is almost entirely owing to the persistent efforts of his disciple, Mr. Walter Bache, to bring it before the public; this system of musical proselytising, forcing a special composer on the public taste (which it must be confessed is very obedient in such matters), being in fact an undesirable characteristic of the conduct of things in the musical world of to-day. The article on Meyerbeer, by Mrs. Julian Marshall, is a very just and able summary of the genius and career of a composer to whom it is very difficult to be precisely just. Among the brief notices of contemporary composers and executants, those connected with organ composition and playing seem inadequately and capriciously executed. We know not whether Van Eyken, the composer of the finest and most remarkable organ sonatas since the memorable set by Mendelssohn,* is to come under letter V; if not, he is apparently unknown to the contributors. On the other hand, the importance of Merkel, who is merely a respectable and rather dull imitator of other composers (and at times a barefaced plagiarist), is greatly exaggerated. Our English player, Best, probably the greatest and most finished executant on the organ who has ever been known, is dismissed in a brief article by a contributor who does not seem the least aware that this player has almost invented a new æsthetic in regard to the effects and combinations of the instrument, that he has developed unsuspected beauties in much of Bach's organ music by his novel and varied treatment of it, and that his bi-weekly recitals for many years on the great organ at

* It is noticeable that in the whole of the long article on Mendelssohn not a word is said of these organ sonatas, one of the composer's most thoroughly original works, and the most remarkable event in organ-composition since the time of Bach. The first sonata has almost by itself made a new era in the method of handling the organ, and has had numbers of imitators.

Liverpool have been one of the most effective means of educating public taste in a large neighbourhood that any single executant has ever realised. On the contrary, some very weak reputations of this kind are blazoned in a manner which could only proceed either from ignorance or from the amiability of personal partiality ; which latter influence, indeed, is too frequently traceable among the minor articles on living musicians, some of which seem like excerpts from the notebooks of a mutual admiration society. One contributor (the author of the Hummel article) lets the cat out of the bag in an amusingly innocent manner when, at the end of an article in praise of a reputation certainly not very widely spread, he adds that certain re-arrangements of classical works for the piano, by the subject of the article, 'are known to his friends.'

The second class of articles, as we have classified them, those on the theory and practice of music, form the most important and difficult, though not the most popular, part of a dictionary of this kind. Their object must be, according to the professed scope of the Dictionary in this case, to give sufficient information on the more abstruse subjects in connexion with music, to convey to the reader a good outline of such subjects, which shall be readable and intelligible to an ordinary amateur, and at the same time give information which is solid and complete as far as it goes. The intelligibility is a difficult matter to decide upon, as it is always difficult for a writer who understands a subject to put himself entirely in the place of those who know little or nothing of it. As in the case of the biographies, the treatment and scale of the theoretic articles of the Dictionary vary exceedingly, and different contributors seem to have very different ideas as to the kind of thing that is wanted. Thus the important subjects 'counterpoint' and 'fugue' are treated by Sir F. Ouseley in two very brief, though, as would be expected, clearly and logically expressed, articles. Although it would be absurd to attempt to treat such subjects completely in a dictionary, still, considering their great importance in music, we should certainly have expected to find them more fully developed. Moreover, we doubt whether anyone who had no *à priori* notion of what a fugue was would make it out very distinctly from Sir F. Ouseley's rather technical account, although it is all perfectly clear and intelligible to those who have been accustomed to listen to and enjoy fugues, and open the article only to learn a little more about the rules which govern this form of composition ; and such persons, on the other hand, will be apt to find the account

rather bald and limited. The article on counterpoint is even more brief, and nothing is said as to the use of, or value attached to, counterpoint in various stages of the art, and the part which it plays in various forms of composition. The uninitiated reader, after going through Sir F. Ouseley's brief article, might still be in the position to ask, 'But what is counterpoint for, what is the good of it?' and he would certainly have more light thrown on the subject if he were led to contrast a specimen of the old and exclusively contrapuntal style of composition, say a fugue of Bach's, with the partial and highly effective use of contrapuntal device by Beethoven in giving picturesque variety to the treatment of a theme; and if he were shown by one or two quotations from, say, the *allegretto* of the Seventh Symphony, how that which is in the first place nearly a pure melody, merely accompanied by harmonies, takes a new form and speaks a new language by being made, in the middle of the movement, the suggestion for an episode in counterpoint, the logical treatment being substituted for the sentimental treatment, so as to evolve something entirely new from it. But Sir F. Ouseley gives his reader no such help towards estimating what may be the place in musical art of counterpoint; he confines himself to hard dry technicalities, stated in language which on the whole is too exclusively technical to attract or to be easily intelligible to the general reader.

In strong contrast to these articles comes the very long and full one on 'Harmony,' by Mr. Hubert Parry. This contributor is one of the 'irrepressible' class of writers, inclined to be wordy and diffuse, a very strong advocate of some theories which have as yet at least only commanded partial acceptance, and an enthusiastic believer in 'progress.' For example, in the latter portion of his article it is observed that 'in the large majority of cases the simultaneous occurrence of all the diatonic notes of the scale would be quite inadmissible, but composers have shown how it could be done, and there is no reason why some other composer should not show how all the chromatic notes can be added also' (all sounded simultaneously, that is), 'and if the principles by which he arrived at the combination stand the test of analysis, musicians must bow and acknowledge his right to the combination.' *Dii meliora!* We trust that we may be peacefully removed from the scene before this climax arrives; in the meantime we may humbly suggest that, after all, the ear goes for something in music. But in spite of this and other 'hazardous progressions' (as a musical theorist of the old school might

call them), we recommend Mr. Parry's article as a very clever one, comprising a great deal of interesting historical information, and including many very suggestive critical remarks calculated to set the reader thinking. The same kind of praise, with similar limitations, may be given to his article on musical 'Form,' in which the history of the development of what are now known as the leading forms of composition is very fully and systematically presented, and handled for the most part in a broad and philosophical spirit. The defects of the article arise from the writer's too little respect for the severely logical forms of the pre-Beethoven composers, while his strong bias towards emancipation from strict forms leads him, like other critics of his school, to underrate very much the place which strict form takes in the art of Beethoven. Everyone, he observes, is familiar with the opening passages of the 'Waldstein' and 'appassionata' sonatas, in both of which 'a new key is introduced in less than half a dozen bars, and then passes back to the principal key; and this practice is not done in the vague way so often met with in Mozart and Haydn, where their excessive use of rapid transitions in the third section of the movement has the effect of men beating about in the dark.' This must be felt by every competent and impartial hearer of the works of Mozart and Haydn to be a most false and prejudiced criticism. To no composers could such a phrase as 'beating about in the dark' be less applicable. Their standpoint and their method of treating the art were different from the modern method (which may sometimes be better described as want of method), but they knew exactly what they wanted to do, and never lost their grasp of their materials. In fact, the writer almost perversely applies to the older school of composers criticism which is much more applicable to the modern school. He says, and we quite concur, that

'it is most important for a young student to avoid the hasty conclusion that to modulate much is to be free and bold, for it is nothing of the sort. Irregular purposeless modulation is sheer weakness and vanity. Strength is shown in nothing more conspicuously than in the capacity to continue long in one key without ceasing to be interesting; and when that is effected, a bold stroke of well-defined modulation comes with its proper force.'

Anyone would suppose that this was a quotation from an article in favour of the older school of composition and in depreciation of modern eccentricities, so perversely misapplied is the criticism, which shows that Mr. Parry, while plucking a mote out of his brother's eye, has a rather formidable beam in

his own. Again, in speaking of Beethoven, the writer, like others of his school, endeavours to represent that composer in a position of antagonism to strict form in composition, such as he never really held. Though influenced at first by Mozart, this grand spirit, he says, soon asserted itself, 'especially in that 'which seems the very marrow of his works, and makes form 'appear in an entirely new phase, the element of universally 'distributed intensity. To him that by-word, "brilliant ' "passages," was as hateful as "cant" to Carlyle.' This is a statement, if not entirely erroneous, conveying an utterly false impression. 'Universally distributed intensity' is, to begin with, one of the greatest artistic faults that there can be; it is what makes much of the music of Liszt and Rubinstein, for instance, so fatiguing to the mind and the ear, which are alike oppressed by a want of balance, proportion, and repose. If Beethoven had really shown the same characteristics, he would not have been so great a musical artist as he is. The statement that he abhorred the idea of brilliant passages is absurd. He would perhaps have protested against the expression as a cant and inadequate one; but he was fully alive to the artistic importance of ornament in his compositions, and was very particular, too, about the way in which it was executed, as every thorough artist would be. If the first movement of the Op. 109 Sonata, and the last of the set of Variations in the same work, do not exhibit 'brilliant passages' elaborated for the sake of brilliancy, we know not where to look for them; and the Variations movement of the Op. 111 Sonata is almost entirely composed of 'brilliant passages.' To say that to Beethoven it was impossible 'to use bombast and 'gesticulation at a particular spot because the laws of form 'point to that spot as requiring bustle and noise,' is only true in so far that brilliant effect in its proper place is not to be regarded as 'bombast and gesticulation,' whether it be employed by Mozart or by Beethoven. What is the long coda to the *finale* of the Symphony in A, with its increasing tumult of sound and whirl of scale passages for the strings—what is this but 'bustle and noise' (if a writer chooses to use such terms) employed where the laws of form seem to demand it, at the winding up of a brilliant movement? In this and in numbers of other passages, especially in his pianoforte sonatas, Beethoven seeks for brilliancy of effect by means which differ from those of Mozart only by being generally more varied in design and more effective. The element of brilliancy and display is, in fact, an important part of musical utterance, and he who is destitute of all sympathy with it is an unhealthy order of

genius, and likely to produce (as musicians so constituted have produced) very dull music. Much, however, of this article is very good in criticism, even when clumsily expressed; we quote, for example, a paragraph in regard to Beethoven's manner of developing and treating the themes in the second part of a movement:—

'In the part devoted to the development of the features of the subjects, which commonly commences the second half of the movement, Beethoven is especially great. No musician ever had such a capacity for throwing an infinite variety of lights upon one central idea; it is no "business" or pedantry, but an extraordinary genius for transforming rhythms and melodies, so that, though they be recognised by the hearer as the same which he has heard before, they seem to tell a totally different story; just as the same ideas working in the minds of men of different circumstances or habits of thought may give them the most opposite feelings. As was pointed out with reference to Mozart, no system is deducible from the order of this division of the movement, than which none shows more infallibly the calibre of the composer. As a rule, Beethoven avoids the complete statement of any of his subjects, but breaks them up into their constituent figures, and mixes them up in new situations, avoiding cadences and uniformity of groups of bars and rhythms.* As far as possible the return to the original key is marked in some more refined way than the matter-of-fact plan of baldly passing to its dominant, pausing, and recommencing operations. The *reprise* of the first subject is sufficient indication to the hearer as to what part of the movement he has arrived at, and the approaches to it require to be so fined off, that it may burst upon him with the extra force of a surprise. Sometimes a similar effect is obtained by the totally opposite course of raising expectation by hints of what is to come, and then deferring it in such a manner that the suspended anticipation of the mind may heighten the sense of pleasure in its gratification, as in the last movement of the "Waldstein Sonata." Again, the return is not unfrequently made the climax of a grand culmination of increasing force and fury, such as that in the first movement of the "Waldstein Sonata" (where the return is *pp*),† and the 4th and 8th Symphonies, a device which is as moving to the hearer as either of the two former ones, and equally intense and original.'

* This last remark, however, is not by any means true of Beethoven's practice in all, or even in the majority of cases; in general he is rhythmical enough, though he spurns at rhythm sometimes.

† *A propos* of which, we remember the tremendous effect produced by Rubinstein in playing this sonata at the Philharmonic Society some years ago, by disregarding the *pp* mark at the re-entry of the theme, and bringing it in with a *fortissimo* which threw the previous *crescendo* into the shade, and seemed to make the piano fill the whole hall. The license was, of course, strictly speaking, unpardonable; yet we could not help thinking we could have fancied Beethoven himself doing the same with it in a moment of impetuosity.

This is, in the main, so true a characterisation of Beethoven's practice in the part of the composition referred to, that it is only a pity it is not better expressed. There are worse literary defects to be found in Mr. Parry's writing, however, than mere obscurity of style; e.g. 'With Haydn and Mozart' it is frequent to find very sweet tunes, and sometimes very 'serious and pregnant tunes, in each of the primary sections, and then a lot of scurrying about—"brilliant passages," as they are often called.' Now 'a lot of scurrying about' is very vulgar English, and 'it is frequent to find' is not English at all.

Notwithstanding these defects of style and the strong bias which runs through many of them, these theoretical articles by Mr. Parry deserve to be classed among the most noteworthy set of contributions to the Dictionary, and show evidence of an intention to go to what the writer regards as the root of the matter. It is partly for that very reason that we regret their want of balance, the feeling they constantly convey that we are listening to an advocate for a special view of musical art rather than to a judicial and impartial critic. Thus, in the article on 'Melody,' everyone who is acquainted with the manner in which this quality in music has been regarded in theory and exemplified in practice by Wagner, must perceive that the view of melody suggested in the article is really a piece of special pleading. To say that 'the term melody is often 'with justice applied to the inner parts of fine contrapuntal 'writing' is no doubt quite true; indeed the statement hardly goes far enough, for contrapuntal writing is really the combination of separate melodies, and unless each separate part is really a melody agreeable by itself, the composition does not deserve to be called 'fine contrapuntal writing.' But when the author adds that 'examples will occur to everyone in numerous 'choruses and symphony movements and other instrumental 'works where melody is so perfectly woven into the substance 'of the work that it cannot be singled out as a complete tune 'or air, though it nevertheless stands out from the rest by reason 'of its greater beauty,' he is merely repeating the fallacy of Wagner in his talk about 'the vast forest melody,' in using the same word 'melody' to represent two totally different ideas—a fallacy which we pointed out in a former article in this Journal.* The article on 'Leit-motiv,' again, is a piece of advocacy of a special trick of a special school of modern

* 'Wagner and Modern Music,' *Edinburgh Review*, No. 291, January 1876.

composers, which is not an essential element of musical composition. Attempts have been made to show that Beethoven, upon whom all the waywardnesses of modern music are fathered, laid great stress on this device, but how little he really cared or thought of it is evident from the extreme difficulty which the believers in 'Leit-motiv' have in making out even the few examples they are able to give from Beethoven, and the absurd way round they go to manufacture them; and the article is quite disproportionate to the real importance of the subject. It might not unfairly have been treated somewhat in this way :—

LEIT-MOTIV: a contrivance whereby composers who are deficient in the gift of melody are enabled, when they have with difficulty evolved one passage which may be called a melody, to make it do duty through a whole composition of several movements, by cutting it up and reproducing the fragments more or less disguised by changes of accent or of *tempo*. They then claim for the composition special excellence as being a 'consistent whole.'

This, though it is not far from the truth, would also be unsuited for a dictionary article, since it represents a bias in the opposite direction; but it is quite as judicial as Mr. Parry's article, and has at least the advantage of being shorter. It is another example of the extraordinary disproportion in the treatment of subjects in this Dictionary, that two pages and a half should be expended on this mere whim of a clique of musicians, while such a subject as 'counterpoint,' a subject underlying the whole of the more serious forms of composition since the development of music as an art, is disposed of in some brief remarks compressed into a page and a half. The best of Mr. Parry's articles appears to us to be that on 'Modulation,' which is admirably suggestive in the light it throws on the real meaning of modulation and its development in various periods of the art, and is less diffuse and more clearly expressed than many of the others. Mr. Parry has great enthusiasm and apparently a wide range of musical reading; what he wants is a better acquaintance with English grammar and construction, a more concentrated and logical style of writing, and a broader and more balanced view of the art, which would keep in check his prepossessions in favour of what is called (or mis-called) 'progress' above everything else, and his tendency to regard music as the special property of one particular school of critics.*

* Some thoughtful and suggestive remarks on the philosophy of music may be disinterred from the depths of a ponderous volume on 'The Power of Sound,' by Mr. Edmund Gurney, which has reached

Among other articles which may be classed under the head of musical theory, though dealing to some extent with practical details of execution, may be named the very able and interesting one on 'Additional Accompaniments,' by Mr. Ebenezer Prout, in which the history of this branch of musical practice, which has now become a large, perhaps a dangerously large one, is traced, and the principles which should guide musicians in thus filling up the outlines of the work of their predecessors laid down with much judgment and thorough comprehension; and those by Mr. Franklin Taylor on 'Appoggiatura' and 'Arpeggio,' which may serve to give to amateurs some idea of the artistic importance, in the expression or execution of music, of many apparently small details. We hope that an article on the pianoforte, its history, treatment, and æsthetics, may be forthcoming in its proper place from the pen of the same excellent pianist and admirable critic and teacher of his art.*

But we must pass to a brief notice of some of the longer articles on the history of various branches of composition. Of these the most important so far is that on 'Opera,' by Mr. W. S. Rockstro. The author takes a very broad view of his subject, as including all combinations of dramatic representation with music, and considers opera in this light as one of the oldest institutions in existence. 'Its earliest librettists were Æschylus and Sophocles, its earliest orchestra a band of lyres and flutes. There is no doubt about this. It is quite certain that not only were the choruses of the "Agamemnon" and "Antigone" sung to the grandest music that could be produced at the time they were written, but also that every word of the dialogue was musically declaimed.' This is one of the very best articles in the Dictionary; full in information, clear and yet eloquent in literary style, and pervaded by a perfectly impartial and balanced critical spirit, which strikes us with the more satisfaction from the too notable want of this quality in other important articles. Part of the first paragraph gives the key to the spirit in which the writer approaches his subject, and is worth quoting:—

us since this article was written. As far as we have had time to dig into it, the views of the writer appear to us to be just and true, but he would have secured a far better chance of having them read if he had remembered that it is not always judicious or convenient to attempt to tell the whole truth at once.

* Since this was written, we have received Part XII. of the Dictionary, containing an admirable article on the history and æsthetics of pianoforte-playing by Herr Pauer, than whom there could be no better exponent of the subject.

'Musical dialogue has been censured, by unmusical critics, as contrary to nature. It is undoubtedly contrary to the practice of everyday life, but not to the principles of art. It is necessary that the truth of this proposition should be very clearly established, for, unless we make it our starting-point, we shall never arrive at the true *raison d'être* of the lyric drama, or be prepared with a satisfactory answer to the cavils of those writers who, like Addison and Steele, condemn it as a monstrous anomaly. It is open to no charge of inconsistency to which the spoken drama is not equally exposed. The poet writes his tragedy in verse, because he thereby gains the power of expressing great thoughts with the greatest amount of dignity that language can command. His verses are sung, in order that they may be invested with a deeper pathos than the most careful form of ordinary declamation can reach. No one objects to the iambics of the "Seven against Thebes," nor to the blank verse of "King John;" yet surely our sense of the fitness of things is not more rudely shocked by the melodious "Ah! soccorso! Son tradito!" uttered by the Commendatore after Don Giovanni has pierced him through with his sword, than by the touching couplet with which Prince Arthur, at the moment of his death, breaks forth into rhyme—

"O me! my uncle's spirit is in these stones;
Heaven take my soul, and England keep my bones!"

The conventionalities of common life are violated no less signally in the one case than in the other; yet, in the opera as well as in the play, the result of their violation is an artistic conception, as easily defensible on logical grounds as the proportions of a statue or the colouring of a picture—neither of which are faithful imitations of nature, though founded upon a natural ideal.'

The closing sentence assumes, perhaps, a little too much: whether the object of painting is to faithfully reproduce nature is one of the questions often debated in relation to this art, which is capable of being regarded in more ways than one. But the paragraph shows an application of common sense to the consideration of the *rationale* of opera which it is at least refreshing to meet with. We cannot undertake even to give a synopsis of the general scope of the article, which is a very long one, though by no means too long for the importance and interest of the subject; it contains a great amount of historical information, and pursues the subject through a number of what the writer defines as distinct periods in the modern treatment of lyric drama, from the first period arising out of the aspirations of a small band of disciples of the æsthetic, who met at Giovanni Bardi's house in Florence at the close of the sixteenth century, 'with the avowed object of resuscitating the 'style of musical declamation peculiar to Greek tragedy,' to the twentieth period, in which 'we find ourselves brought face to 'face with a master whose earnest devotion to the cause of

'art entitles his opinions to a more than ordinary measure of 'respectful consideration.' Referring the reader to the Dictionary itself for Mr. Rockstro's treatment of the intermediate periods, we may call attention to the value and sound critical judgment of his remarks on the art of Wagner. Criticism and party spirit in music have run so wild on this subject, that it is quite an unexpected pleasure to meet with a writer who is capable of discussing the question dispassionately and with justice to both sides. After giving a brief sketch of the course of Wagner's method in opera from the composer's earlier works to the tetralogy, he points out in the first place that his idea is only a return to principles that have been enunciated and exemplified before.

'It is the fullest possible development of the idea that was proposed, in the year 1600, at the house of Giovanni Bardi at Florence. Wagner looks back to Greek tragedy as the highest available authority on the subject. So did Rinuccini. Wagner condemns rhythmic melody as altogether opposed to dramatic truth. So did Peri. Wagner keeps his instrumental performers out of sight, in order that he may carry out the illusions of the drama. So did Emilio del Cavaliere, and Peri after him. Wagner uses all the orchestral resources at his command, for the purpose of enforcing his dramatic meaning. So, in 1607, did Monteverde. The only difference is, that Monteverde had but a rude untutored band to work with, while Wagner has a magnificent orchestra, fortified by the experience of two hundred and eighty years.'

In process of time the love of melodic forms was allowed to overpower the dramatic consistency of the whole, and Gluck was the composer who took up arms in the cause of reform.

'No one can say that his principles have been fully carried out by later composers—that too many operas of the present day, in more schools than one, are not grievously lowered in tone by the pernicious habit of introducing irrelevant, if not positively flippant tunes, in situations where they are altogether out of place. Against these abuses Wagner has waged implacable war, and in so doing he has merited the thanks of all who have the true interests of the lyric drama at heart; for the evils which he has made it the business of his life to eradicate are no light ones, and he has entered upon his task with no faltering hand. Only, while giving him all due honour for what he has done, let us not wrong either himself or his cause by pretending to give him more than his due. He has called our attention not, as some will have it, to a new creation, but to a necessary reform. He has nothing to tell us that Gluck has not already said; and Gluck said nothing that had not been already said by Peri. The reformation, so far as recitative, declamation, and melody are concerned, is nothing more than a return to the first principles laid down at the Conte di Vernio's *réunions*. It brings us therefore not one step in advance of the position that was reached little less than three centuries ago.'

So much for what Wagner has accomplished; but the writer has something to say very much to the point as to how he has accomplished it. In regard to the freedom from the usual restraints of harmonic relation and contrapuntal device, which has been claimed by Wagner and his followers, he observes that 'if that which sounds well must necessarily,' as they affirm, 'be right,' is it not also true that 'that which does not sound well must of necessity be wrong'? It seems difficult to dispute this; yet, says Mr. Rockstro, 'our ears are sometimes very sorely tried,' and he gives one quotation of 'hideously out-of-tune effect' from one of Wagner's operas, which might be multiplied by the dozen. The great mischief of this is that such assaults on the ear are regarded by lesser composers as characteristics of the master's style, and imitated *usque ad nauseam*. It may, as Mr. Rockstro says, take a long day to tire us of Wagner; but we cannot take him at second hand. "Wagnerism" neither gods nor men can tolerate.' Regarding the probable ultimate future and influence of Wagner's art as a whole, however, there is an admirable paragraph of summing up, the greater part of which we will quote, the rather as it precisely repeats and enforces, sometimes in curiously similar language, opinions we have expressed in previous articles on Wagner and Mozart. After observing that it seems simply impossible that such works as 'Der fliegende Holländer' and 'Die Meister-Singer von Nürnberg' should be forgotten twenty years hence, that it seems much more probable that they and some others (in regard to which others we do not entirely concur) will be more liked and better understood at that date, Mr. Rockstro adds, 'What about the "Tetralogy"? does there seem a reasonable hope that that too may live?' The probable longevity of a work of art may, he thinks, be pretty accurately measured by the nobility of its conception; we would add, by this quality combined with the perfection of its form and finish; but, waiving that, let the Dictionary writer proceed:—

'Now, it is a universally received axiom, that, of two works of art, both equally true to nature, that in which the greatest effect is produced by the least expenditure of means will prove to be the noblest. The greatest operas we have are placed upon the stage with wonderfully little expense. For the worthy representation of "Fidelio" we need only some half-dozen principal singers, a chorus, an ordinary orchestra, and a couple of scenes such as the smallest provincial theatre could provide at a few hours' notice. For "Der Freischütz" we only need, in addition to this, a few special "properties," and a pound or two of "red fire." But, in order that "Der Ring des Niebelungen" might be fitly represented, it was found necessary to build a new theatre; to construct an orchestra upon principles hitherto untried,

and to fill it with a matchless company of instrumentalists representing the most brilliant talent in Europe; to enrich the *mise en scène* with waves, clouds, mists, flames, vapours, a dragon—made in London and sent to Bayreuth in charge of a special messenger—and other accessories which put the stabled horses and led elephants of “Berenice,” and the singing birds of “Rinaldo,” to shame; and, regardless of expense, to press into the service of the new school all the aids that modern science could contribute or modern ingenuity invent. Surely this is a great sign of weakness. There must be something wanting in a drama which needs these gorgeous accompaniments to make it attractive; and it is difficult to believe that such a display will ever again be attempted, except under the immediate superintendence of the author of the piece. But, supposing the “Tetralogy” should be banished from the stage, from sheer inability to fulfil the necessary conditions of its production, will the principles on which it is composed be banished with it? Is it not possible that Wagner’s teaching may live, even though some of the grandest of his own individual conceptions be forgotten? Undoubtedly it will live, in so far as it is founded on pure natural principles. We have already spoken of his intense reverence for dramatic truth. He cannot have taught us the necessity for this in vain. It is absolutely certain that in this particular he will leave a marked impression for good upon the coming generation. Whether or not he has carried his theories too far for successful practice is another question. His disciples say that he has not, and are so firmly convinced of the truth of their position that they will not even hear an argument to the contrary. Nevertheless, there are many who, despite their unfeigned admiration for his undoubted talent, believe that the symmetrical forms he has so sternly banished might have been, and still may be, turned to good account, without any real hindrance to dramatic action; and many there are who doubt whether the old Florentine ideal, reinforced by all that modern improvement can do for it, can ever be made to take the place of that which Mozart so richly glorified, and from which even Beethoven and Weber only differed in individual treatment. The decision of these questions must be left for the future. At present, “Non più andrai” and “Madamina” still hold their ground, and may possibly win the day after all.

It would have been well indeed for the future of Mr. Grove’s Dictionary if all the contributors on subjects involving serious critical considerations had been able to take so broad a view as this, and to express themselves in terms which would have equal chance of being read with respect and with conviction fifty years hence.

By the same author is the interesting and valuable article on musical ‘Notation,’ which we have only space to mention, merely observing that we are glad to see the writer takes the opportunity, in closing his article, of expressing his opinion in favour of the really very satisfactory and complete character of our

musical notation, almost spontaneous as its development has been, as against any of the proposed methods of improved notation which it is attempted to force on the popular ear as royal roads to reading music. It is difficult, as he says, 'to conceive any combination of sounds consistent with what we believe to be the true principles of musical science, which it is incapable of expressing;' and he is perfectly correct and well-timed in his remark that the Tonic Sol-fa system (the only new notation system which has in this country received any attention at all) 'could never be used for any other purpose than that of very commonplace part-singing, while the time spent in acquiring it could scarcely fail, if devoted to the study of ordinary notation, to lead to far higher results.*' Among other important articles of the historical class may be mentioned that on 'Anthem' by Dr. E. G. Monk; that on 'Mass,' also by Mr. Rockstro, and a worthy companion to the opera article; 'Motet,' by the same hand; that on 'Overture' by Mr. H. J. Lincoln, and other minor articles. The important subjects of 'Oratorio,' 'Symphony,' and 'Sonata,' are not yet published at the time these remarks are written, our last number of the Dictionary, at the time of writing this, taking us as far as the commencement of 'Palestrina.'

The articles on 'Orchestra' and 'Orchestration' might be classed with either the historical portion or that which treats of instruments, since the orchestra is really the great instrument, the central means of instrumental expression. That on 'Orchestra' is again by Mr. Rockstro, who is a pillar of strength to the Dictionary. We may just refer to the fact that he takes the opportunity to say something opportune on two points on which reform is required. The one is on the misrepresentation of old scores, such as those of Bach, by the entirely different proportion kept in modern orchestras between the strings and the reed wind instruments. 'If Bach considered fourteen stringed instruments a fair balance for two hautboys and two bassoons, common sense should tell us that to balance fifty-six stringed instruments we should need eight hautboys and

* Let those who are concerned with the promotion of musical education in our primary schools take note of this. At present the apostles of the 'Tonic Sol-fa' heresy are in high dudgeon with the Education Department for ignoring their nostrum and insisting on ordinary notation alone being recognised as 'teaching from note.' The Department are quite in the right: the only mistake is in not enforcing teaching from note wherever any grant is given at all for the teaching of music, instead of palliating the useless illusion of teaching (?) 'by ear.'

'eight bassoons.' This consideration of orchestral balance is very important and much overlooked. Even since Beethoven's day the force of the string band in a large orchestra has been so increased that his effects are often distorted. There are in the *finale* of the Seventh Symphony, for instance, passages of answer and imitation between string and wind instruments which are never heard as the composer intended them. Conductors should look to these points, and institute reconsideration and reform in regard to them. With equal justice Mr. Rockstro inveighs against the opposite practice of dosing an orchestral composition with a mass of noisy brass instruments, merely to satisfy the modern demand for 'the power of sound.' 'Are we,' he asks, 'never again to hear the "Occasional Over-ture" except in a disguise worthy of that to "Tannhäuser," or the march at the end of it played by other instruments than those used for the march in the "Prophète"?' In no other art but that of music would such abuses be permitted.' We endorse and give further circulation to this remark in the hope that it may set some of those who have power over such matters to think of their sins and shortcomings. The article on 'Orchestration' is an excellent one by Mr. Ebenezer Prout, and we only wish the treatment of so fascinating a subject by a writer so well able to treat it were carried to greater length, as it well might have been, considering its importance. The subject of the 'Organ' is treated very fully, and with a considerable number of illustrations, by Mr. E. J. Hopkins, and supplies all the information that anyone not a professional student of the instrument can want in regard to it—as far, at least, as its history and construction are concerned. The article is illustrated with diagrams of the construction of the modern organ, besides some reproductions of very curious representations of ancient organs, illustrating the infancy of the great instrument in the days when Chaucer could speak of it as the 'merrie organ.' Mr. Hopkins passes over the opportunity, which occurs naturally in the course of his own remarks, of making a protest against one vice of modern organ-building, which, in the interests of the ears of the public and of 'organic' art, we will make for him. In speaking of one of the organs of Schulze, the great modern German builder, he observes that the boldness and strength of tone of this organ were due, not to a high pressure of wind, but to the large scale of the pipes, and allowing twice or thrice the usual quantity of wind to enter at the feet of the pipes—in other words, a larger area at the pipe foot. It is the constant complaint of people who hear our large modern organs that their

louder portions are so hard and cutting in tone, but few people have any idea why this is. It is simply because, in order to comply with the supposed modern desire for brilliancy, and in consequence of the rivalry between builders on this point, the wind is forced into the pipes at a pressure sometimes five or six times as great as what was usual in the older days of organ-building; the result is to make the instrument like a collection of tuned steam whistles, and to produce, not *tone*, but mere *noise*. The pressure of wind in an organ is measured by its power to drive up water in a glass syphon-shaped tube, one arm of which is inserted in an aperture of the soundboard. The ordinary strength of wind in old organs was a 'three-inch wind,' a force which lifted the water in the opposite arm of the syphon three inches, and it was often less than this. But in one well-known great modern organ in London, the harsh and unsympathetic tone of which is constantly complained of, the majority of pipes on the principal manual are on a 12-inch wind, and the most powerful reed stops on the same manual on a 25-inch wind. The consequence is that the whole of these pipes are sounded at high pressure, like a singer forcing his voice to a scream; and the only portion of the instrument which really tells satisfactorily is the 'choir organ,' which is on the old three-inch wind, and 'travels' better than all the rest. Schulze keeps his organs on the old wind pressure, but seeks for sonorous effect in the right way, by large scale of pipes and thick metal; but then Schulze does not build organs cheap, whereas some of our most celebrated English builders, bidding against each other in price, are content to save money by small-scale pipes and thin metal, and then force the wind into them at high pressure to produce the requisite noise, losing all the dignity, volume, and massiveness of sound which characterise a really grand organ. It is worth while to draw public attention to this, as, when it is known why many of our modern organs are so noisy and unmusical, there will perhaps be a demand for reform in this respect. Nothing is said in Mr. Hopkins's article as to the artistic use of the organ, its combinations and effects. Perhaps this subject is intended to be considered in part under the head of 'Registration;' * if not, it is a serious omission.

* The stops of an organ are often technically called the 'registers;' hence the awkward and apparently unmeaning word 'registration,' which is the only expression we have for the study of effect and combination of tone on the organ, and means the same in regard to it that 'orchestration' means in regard to the orchestra.

We do not dwell upon the other articles on the description of instruments, as we have naturally selected for comment those subjects in the Dictionary which were least technical, and could be best discussed in a literary review. We may just observe that they seem all to be very well and thoroughly done, conveying as much information in regard to each instrument as can well be looked for under the circumstances. The great variety of brief articles giving explanations of various terms, &c., in music, seem very complete, and in some cases there is a special point and significance in the way the definitions are given. Thus, in the editor's note on the expression 'cantabile,' we are given a passage from the first movement of Beethoven's 'Ninth Symphony,' which is marked 'cantabile,' on which it is observed, 'He has marked it before "espresso," but now it is as if he said "You may see no special melody in this group, but I do, and will have it played accordingly." This is very well put, and indicates how to look for the true value of some of the conventional technical directions made use of in music.

To sum up—no one can turn over this Dictionary without reflecting what a number and variety of subjects of interest are grouped round the central subject of musical art, nor without perceiving that these volumes comprise a great mass of information, more varied than is to be found in any other single musical publication in our language; and in regard to facts we believe that the information is in the main exceptionally accurate, and that exceptional care, in some cases at least, has been taken to render it so. Among minor points, the careful tabulating of the works of most of the great composers, with their dates of composition, and the lists given of books, from which more detailed information on the main subjects may be acquired, are features in the publication which add greatly to its convenience and usefulness. There is most of the material in it for a dictionary of the most complete type. What it has wanted has been a stronger guiding hand, a general and comprehensive editing which should have brought it to a consistent whole, by which subjects which are now inadequately treated should have been ensured full consideration, and contributions which the enthusiasm of their writers had carried to too great a length should have been reduced to fitting proportions, while critical opinions which were the mere offspring of the fashion of the hour or of the bias of a special school, should have been either cancelled or reduced to their proper place as tentative suggestions. Even in minor points of wording we find a want of the consistency

which an active central authority would have enforced. Why, for instance, in an English dictionary written for English readers, should contributors be allowed to speak of a 'Vorspiel' and a 'Singspiel,' &c., when the words 'prelude' and 'operetta' have long since passed into accepted usage as English words? * But this inconsistency and want of proportion in small things and great, we believe, is really owing in great measure to the fact that the editor has not had time to take this thorough charge of the work; that it has been as much as he could do to supply his own contributions and to induce competent people to supply the numerous other subjects which had to be considered; that he has executed as well as he could, and better than most people could under the circumstances, a work which it argues great spirit and energy to have brought towards completion at all amid the distractions of a busy life. As it is, he has succeeded in publishing a book which brings within easy reach of general readers a very large stock of musical information, and which, for one reason or other, it would be worth while for everyone interested in music to possess; and if the work proves a commercial success, and further editions are called for, we may hope that when the editor has attained the greater ease and leisure in life which his friends would wish for him, he may be able, either solely or with the assistance of some able coadjutor, to bring forth a revised edition in which the shortcomings and disproportions which we find in this may be entirely amended. And if that opportunity arrives, we may hope that some judicious contributor will supply one defect in the Dictionary which the editor could not himself supply, by surreptitiously interpolating an article giving some account of 'Grove, George, 'an enthusiastic and indefatigable musical amateur.'

* In the artistic world we seem lately to have 'been at a great feast of languages, and stolen the scraps.' English etchers give French titles to their works, and English musicians give German titles to their compositions, as if they imagined there were some occult æsthetic influence in a foreign language. Surely, as Sir Hugh Evans says, 'This is affectations.'

ART. IX.—*History of the Invasion of the Crimea.* By A. W. KINGLAKE. Vol. VI.: 'The Winter Troubles.' Edinburgh: 1880.

MR. KINGLAKE has in this book not altogether come up to the standard which he has himself created by his former literary achievements. He has taught us to expect literary workmanship polished with a degree of labour which few in these days care to bestow. He has acquired an easy and amusing style, and his taste, by which we mean that subtle tact of authorship which results in well-ordered matter and agreeable manner, has hitherto been pure. If at times he has given us passages which a critic might set down as mere fine writing, he has compensated for it by many a page of good nervous English, racy, forcible, and idiomatic. His descriptions are singularly clear, and no one is ever a moment in doubt about his meaning. His sentences are often elaborated until they achieve the highest triumph of art: they look artless. He is merciful in one respect, he has always in mind the saying, that 'easy writing makes hard reading.' He pays his reader the compliment of taking pains. So far, Mr. Kinglake is entitled to our gratitude; but that is all that can truthfully be said. Our admiration for Mr. Kinglake's former performance does not blind us to the grave defects of his present volume.

The Crimean War presents but few movements of strategy. A few considerable battles—Alma, Inkerman, Balaclava, and the Tchernaya—relieved the monotony of the siege, but the most ample narrative of these important incidents could furnish forth but an insignificant part of the three thousand five hundred pages, more or less, which the completed book will contain. It was, no doubt, the general opinion at the time when Mr. Kinglake's history was planned that the war with Russia would be an isolated effort, gigantic in extent and decisive in character; that it would settle European politics for at least a quarter of a century, and be the last fight which for many years would ruffle the general peace. We now know that the invasion of the Crimea was but an episode, and that its importance has been completely dwarfed by succeeding events.

It perhaps would not be fair to blame Mr. Kinglake because, in 1863, he exaggerated the importance of that which looked so imposing; it may be that the consciousness of his miscalculation has had its effect in producing the signs of weariness that have been more easily remarkable in each succeeding volume. Be that as it may, the one before us exhibits more

than its share of the defects discernible in its predecessors, together with some that could not be charged against them. In the first place, the book contains but a poor pennyworth of bread to an intolerable deal of sack. The volume is a bundle of digressions, each of which might have been effective at the time, but now has little more interest than a dissertation on the use of chain armour. To have the main action of the story interrupted in the sixth volume of its course by a long historical retrospect on English army administration since the time of Pitt, is an unfair trial of the reader's patience. Moreover, the dissertation is by no means accurate. It is a pamphlet written to support a theory, and has a large measure of the defects which distinguish that kind of composition.

If in the pages which follow, the main argument of the present volume is spoken of in strong terms of blame, it is not because the writer of them is hostile to Mr. Kinglake or unmindful of his great merit. When shall we ever read again pages so bright as the inimitable 'Eöthen,' or any historical writing so free, full, and graphic as the story of the fight on the Alma, and the chapters which relate to the flank march round Sebastopol, and the seizure of Balaclava? In narrative Mr. Kinglake is unsurpassed; in patient piecing together of individual stories for the purpose of giving an accurate picture of the incidents of a great battle, he has few equals. But he has a fatal tendency to invent theories and support them by paradox. This he has done to an extent which goes far to destroy the usefulness of the present volume. We willingly admit that he has not exaggerated the want of preparation which characterised our supply and transport services in 1854. But he has invented, in order to account for them, an elaborate theory which has no facts whatever to rest upon. His contention is that a proper organisation of our army was rendered impossible by our monarchical system. He traces all our defects to the interference of the sovereign in army affairs, and he so interweaves his account of actual shortcomings in point of organisation with repeated assertions of his theory, that the reader, unless he is very careful, is apt to be misled, and to suppose that there must be some truth in what is so emphatically, nay, passionately, asserted. In order to make good his position, Mr. Kinglake misreads history in a way for which it is hard to find any adequate expression. But the reader will see, if he will take the trouble to follow us, that both the evidence he adduces and that which he omits to notice are almost equally strong against him. He is a man with a Theory, and also a man with a Mission. In both these cases

one who deals with evidence is apt to have his judgment warped. The Theory is that under our Monarchical system the control of the Crown over the discipline and command of the army is in itself dangerous, and is so used as to subvert the constitutional basis on which it purports to rest. The Mission is, as Mr. Kinglake's readers have long been aware, to clear the memory of Lord Raglan from some blame which has been cast upon it.

With the constitutional theory we have no sympathy; we think it wrong in principle, an unwarranted attack on the power assigned by the Constitution to the Crown, and untenable in fact. Towards the Mission we have a more kindly feeling—we would indeed gladly aid in it, if we could;—but on one point we must disagree firmly with Mr. Kinglake. He thinks it justifiable to sacrifice every other person's reputation to that of Lord Raglan. With every feeling of admiration for the dead leader, with every tenderness for his fame, we intend earnestly to protest against this method of securing it.

But before doing so we will ask the reader's permission to note one or two minor matters to which we shall have no opportunity of recurring. Mr. Kinglake often runs into extravagance of language which is the reverse of impressive. It may be justifiable to find fault with the 'Times,' and Mr. Russell its war correspondent, for publishing information useful to the enemy. We are not going to fight the battle of the 'Times,' or of Mr. Russell, who are exceedingly able to take their own part; but we can hardly think it consistent with literary propriety to accompany a quotation from Mr. Russell's letters with the declaration that, 'at the mere sight of what he penned, he will writhe like a disinterred worm unwittingly cut by the spade.'

There is a device freely used in this volume by Mr. Kinglake, with somewhat irritating effect. He gives to the objects of his admiration or dislike some epithet or nickname, and affixes it to them, so to speak, as a permanent label. From an artistic point of view, the effect is disagreeable. When once the reader's eye has been caught by the trick, his attention is distracted from the subject in hand by watching for the recurring phrase, till at last it jars upon his ear like a note out of tune. The author may quote in his defence his favourite Homer, where morn is always rosy-fingered, Athena always *γλαυκῶπις*, and Ulysses for ever *πολύμητις*. But the cases are hardly parallel. The 'Siege of Sebastopol' is not written in hexameters, and cannot plead the exigencies of metre. As, in English ballad poetry, all the gold is 'red' and

all the ladies 'gay;' so Miss Nightingale and all the ladies who helped her, the ladies who sympathised with her, their clothes, their manner, their mode of walking, indeed, all that belongs to them, are 'gracious.' We are too sincere admirers of Miss Nightingale, and too sensible of the great good she did in the Levantine hospitals, to grudge her any laudatory epithets. Nor do we deny the appropriateness of this particular word when applied singly, not only to her, but to Miss Stanley, Mr. Sidney Herbert, the nurses in general, Lady Stratford de Redcliffe, and Lady George Paget. The 'gracious empire,' 'gracious presence,' 'gracious dynasty' of these kind workers are good phrases: but constantly repeated, the epithet ceases to be distinctive. The word sometimes occurs two or three times in a page, and when we read of a lady-nurse's 'gracious bib-apron,' it is hard not to feel that the proverbial boundary of the sublime has been perilously approached. Unfortunately, all these compliments to gracious ladies and their belongings are paid at the expense of what Mr. Kinglake calls, absurdly enough, 'the males.' Probably none of those who are designated as 'the males' by Mr. Kinglake would wish to deny their sex, but it is unusual and inartistic for an historian habitually to call them so.*

Everybody admits that Miss Nightingale rendered admirable service to the army in the hospitals; but instead of stating the fact, as an ordinary writer would do, and giving reasons for his statement, Mr. Kinglake must needs undertake to maintain a much larger thesis, that all 'males' are, from the accident of sex itself, fools. Mr. Kinglake might possibly find it difficult to prove the mental superiority even of Miss Nightingale to the whole male sex; but it would be still more difficult to maintain that, because Miss Nightingale was superior to the whole male sex, therefore all women are superior to all men. Moreover, the way in which the assertion is pointed and deliberately thrust home, at the expense of men well known, and designated by name, is unkind and unjust. We are not disposed to contradict Mr. Kinglake when he says that Miss Nightingale was possessed of 'commanding genius,' though the phrase is perhaps a strong one; but that lady's services are so ungrudgingly acknowledged by all Englishmen, that they do not require to be based on the ruins of the reputation of every other worker in her particular department.

* Within the limits of twenty pages, 426 to 445, the uncivil generic term is used, always with contemptuous significance, on pp. 426, 427 twice, 428, 430, 439 twice, 440, 441, 442, 445.

Mr. Kinglake's sweeping generalisations mow down reputations wholesale. Those who have the honour of his personal acquaintance know him to be one of the kindest of men. They can hardly understand how he can be guilty of the cruel massacres which he perpetrates. It may, perhaps, be right to erect an idol for the admiration of men, some Lord Raglan or Miss Nightingale; to drape the figure becomingly, to set it on high for all men to admire, to concentrate upon it the most favourable effects of light, to arrange for it a becoming background whose dark shadows may show it up in most prominent relief. We do not quarrel with that. We agree with Mr. Kinglake to a considerable extent in admiration for those whom he himself admires; but when the dark shadows of his background are made to consist of the reputations of a host of minor men, each of whom had his character, his services, and perhaps in a humble way his group of friends and admirers, then we say Mr. Kinglake's hasty generalisations are cruel. When he tells us that there was 'no male in the Levantine' 'hospitals with firmness, decision, or power of initiative,' he is unjustifiably hard on men whose names are known as brave, honest, and capable. He himself says of these very men, in a passage which is eloquent in praise in spite of the depreciatory aside which it contains :

'The will of the males' (always the males!) 'was to go on performing their accustomed duties industriously, steadily, faithfully, each labouring to the utmost, and if needs be to the death, as too often indeed was the case, in the grooving "state of life to which it had "pleased God to call him."'

But of what avail is this kind of praise, well deserved though it be, if it is only written as a kind of palliative, or justificatory explanation in the midst of whole pages of depreciation, composed for the express purpose of contrasting what Mr. Kinglake thinks humdrum excellence, with the brilliant deeds of his central figure? Does he think he glorifies Miss Nightingale by casting under her feet the shattered reputation of the whole medical staff of the army? Miss Nightingale rose to the height of a situation which would have overpowered a narrower nature; but she came armed, when difficulty had already arisen, with powers specially given to surmount that difficulty. She had at her back the whole power of the Minister of the day. She was supported by the will of the nation; she had money and material without stint; she had the newspaper press behind her. She had Mr. MacDonald with the 'Times' fund in his hand to obey her lightest requisition, and she had the ungrudging support of those despised 'males' on whose necks

Mr. Kinglake wants to place her throne. Does it make her success greater to pull down to the dust those who, not having her advantages, had not the opportunity to attempt the task she achieved?

We now come to the two points on which we propose seriously to challenge Mr. Kinglake's accuracy. The present volume contains an account of the sufferings which overtook the army in the winter of 1854 and the early spring of the following year. The story has been told in former volumes of the landing, the battle of the Alma, the flank march which placed the Allied Armies on the south side of Sebastopol, on the Chersonese heights, the battle of Inkerman, and the opening of the siege batteries in October. Up to that time all had gone well. The Allies had not marched straight into Sebastopol, as the people at home, both French and English, confidently believed they would do; but they had encountered the Russians on several occasions, and always with success. The victory of Inkerman had added to their confidence, and they fought with the prestige of victory on their side. The weather had been favourable, supplies were abundant. If large numbers of men had been killed in the great encounters, and a still larger number in the trenches, and by the terrible cholera which followed them from Bulgaria, leaders and men alike believed that when once the siege batteries were in position, an immediate assault, followed by certain victory, would put an end to the campaign, and send them home triumphant before the setting in of winter. Suddenly this bright prospect became clouded, the batteries failed to make a practicable breach, and the memorable hurricane of November 14 broke up the weather. On the morning after the storm the troops found themselves cold, destitute, and hungry, face to face with the certainty of having to pass the winter on the steppe. This contingency had not been sufficiently provided for. The unfortunate soldiers passed through a time of ever-increasing misery. Simple privation increased till it reached the point of famine; suffering from cold was aggravated by want of clothing, till the soldiers died, frozen in the trenches, by scores. The only thing which did not fail was the noble spirit of the officers and men.

When tidings of this breakdown reached England, the public mind was exasperated to a pitch of intensity which can hardly be realised by those who did not actually witness it: inquiries were set on foot both in and out of Parliament as to its cause; stores were forwarded with ever-increasing profusion. The Government was turned out, though it shortly

returned to power with a new chief and a new War Minister. Bitter accusations were directed against everyone who could be supposed to be even remotely responsible for the conduct of the war. The 'system' under which the army was administered was attacked; but a system is too impersonal to satisfy popular fury; the people wanted victims, men on whom they could vent their anger, and whose sufferings and punishment they could see.

After the lapse of six-and-twenty years, we can apportion praise and blame with something like due discretion, and with some degree of that passionless calm which characterises justice. But then Englishmen could see nothing but this: that they had a noble army literally rotting to death. Untold stores of necessaries, and even comforts, were lying on board ship, or on the wharves at Balaclava, and all the power of official organisation at home, and army organisation at the seat of war, could not lift clothing, food, and comforts over the eight miles of impassable quagmire which lay between them and the dying army. The fact was as patent then as it is now. Transport failed, and for want of transport the commissariat failed. Whose duty was it to feed the men? Why did the commissariat not bring up supplies? was there any stint at home? The only answer was that supplies were abundant, but there was no road from Balaclava to the camp by which they could be distributed. Whose duty was it to make the road? To this question there were many replies. Some said the fault lay with the Quartermaster-General, whose department was charged with that duty. Some asserted that the head of the commissariat ought to have invented means, if none existed, to get up his supplies. Some said the Home Government ought to have foreseen the necessity. Some, that the Commander-in-Chief was in fault, whose paramount duty it was to consider fighting and siege work altogether secondary to feeding the army. Those who held that opinion declared that no failure on the part of others could excuse the Commander-in-Chief. It was argued that the first duty of a general was to keep his men alive—to keep them alive he must feed them, and therefore, if they died from want, no default on the part of others could shield him from the reproach of incapacity.

Mr. Kinglake's plea of non-responsibility on the part of Lord Raglan, is contained in the volume before us. The calm judgment of succeeding years has given a verdict differing indeed from his, but by no means unfavourable to the gallant man who commanded our army. It is now felt that Lord

Raglan was a man admirable in many points, estimable in all relations of life, brave, honest, true to his friends, a noble English gentleman; but no genius. He did not perform a task which was beyond his strength; but he did his best. A born soldier might—nay, would—have foreseen the necessity of providing for the winter; and refused to turn to the right hand or to the left till he had secured his communications with his base. No one doubts now that if we had possessed a Von Moltke at home, the road would have been made. No one doubts that if a Wellington had been in the Crimea, having, as Lord Raglan had, full power, even to the power of withdrawing his army as the last resort, he would have so used that power as to insist that a portion of his force should be released from other duty till his road was made. If Lord Raglan had done this, there would have been no such misery as that which afterwards visited his army. He had ample supplies. He would have been in possession of the means of getting them up. Even in a military point of view he would have been stronger, for he would have economised the priceless lives which were squandered in that terrible December. But he had not that commanding genius; he relied on others who prophesied immediate success which would set him free. He allowed an undue amount of work, in proportion to his numbers and that of the French, to be imposed upon his army. He thereby deprived himself of the power to make a road when the making of a road meant the lives of half his men and the health of the rest. Having once lost the chance, it never again came to him; after November 14, 1854, he never again had the power of doing what in his first days on the Chersonese he might have done. He was obliged to acquiesce in the misery which he had not had the genius to avert. Mr. Kinglake in the volume before us, writing of the fall of the Duke of Newcastle from power, uses a sentence which not inaptly sums up the popular judgment on Lord Raglan: ‘In work so momentous as the due supply of our army, he must not only act irreproachably, but also contrive not to fail.’ Once grant that the want of a road was not his fault, and Lord Raglan’s defence is easy—nay, he hardly requires defence, for on no other point can he be seriously attacked. He did all that could then be done for his army when the dark days came. He managed our difficult relations with the French better than any other man; and he was considered as at least the equal in the field of any English general. But Mr. Kinglake is so bent on proving that Lord Raglan was entirely blameless, that he commits himself to two assertions, both of which he

maintains with great vehemence, but which certainly appear to contradict each other. The first is that, whatever was done, Lord Raglan, as the chief and master spirit of the army, was the doer of it; secondly, that for whatever was left undone he was not responsible.

In order to maintain his second proposition, Mr. Kinglake commits what seems to us reckless injustice. When argument fails, he employs scorn and invective. He treats any expression of blame to Lord Raglan as evidence of positive criminality. He denounces demands for information on the part of those whose positive duty it was to make such demands, as the mere device of cowardice wishing to screen its own shortcomings. The Duke of Newcastle, War Minister under Lord Aberdeen, is a special object of Mr. Kinglake's attack. But strong as is Mr. Kinglake's disapproval of the Duke of Newcastle, his vehemence against the Duke is as nothing compared with his onslaught against Lord Panmure, who, under Lord Palmerston's administration, succeeded the Duke as Secretary of State for War. He holds up for public condemnation not only Lord Panmure's official acts, but even his manners, his person, and his speech. He calls him 'a churl,' and accuses him (quite unjustly, as those aver who knew him best) of habitual cursing. The most civil thing he can find to say about him is, that he was more of a rhinoceros than a tiger.

Mr. Kinglake is evidently conscious that even if the want of support accorded by the Home Government to Lord Raglan were fully proved, it would not account for the state of the army. It would be no answer to one who inquired why the Commander-in-Chief did not take measures for the relief of all the misery, to say that he experienced want of sympathy from home. That would show that he suffered one particular form of annoyance from which the rank and file were exempt, but it would not show why they were allowed to starve. If indeed it could be shown that supplies were demanded in vain; that precautions beyond his power to originate were neglected; that measures proposed by him were set aside, or that assistance without which he was powerless to act was withheld; then indeed responsibility would be shifted from his shoulders. But nothing of that kind was even alleged.

Feeling this, Mr. Kinglake turned to the examination of our system of army administration. Here he found, as many others have found, much to censure and little to approve. If Mr. Kinglake had pointed out defects in our army system as they existed five-and-twenty years ago, and had given us an

intelligent account of the manner in which they impeded the public service; if, in describing this system, he had exercised due care, had taken the precaution of understanding the subject, and had given in temperate language the difficulties which beset those who had to administer our War Department under the unusual stress of a great war, he might have drawn an effective picture. But he has not done this. We say, with all respect for Mr. Kinglake, that he has not taken the pains to master his subject. He falls into mistakes from which he might have been saved by five minutes' conversation with any clerk in the War Office. He ventures on misstatements of facts (of course unintentional), and founds an elaborate argument upon them. To use a vulgar phrase, he has discovered a mare's nest.

The name which he gives to this discovery is, 'the interference of the "personal sovereign" in war administration.' This is the key-note of the volume. To this he traces all our winter disasters of 1854; to it he attributes our want of a proper War Department, and, following it from the general argument to the particular instance, he attributes to it the absence of a road from Balaclava to the front, and the consequent sufferings of our troops. It would be far easier, and far more agreeable, to dwell upon those parts of Mr. Kinglake's book which merit praise, than to unravel step by step the fallacies of an intricate argument. But anyone entering upon a critical examination of Mr. Kinglake's volume is compelled, however unwillingly, to express and justify his dissent from a very large portion of it.

Mr. Kinglake tells us that the instrument by which the English sovereigns kept a personal grasp on the army was called the 'Horse Guards,' an institution which he proceeds to describe in the following terms:—

'The "Horse Guards" served as an office in which the "personal King" transacted his army business, and was scarcely in any sense a department of the State, having in it not even one member of the responsible government, and owning simply the King, the "personal King" as its master, with, by way of vice-master, a general or field-marshal who, in plainly confessed derogation of the constitutional principle applied as a rule to state counsels, was allowed to advise the King behind the backs of his ministers, and from the King—the actual personal King—had always to take his orders.'

After insisting that this was an un-English and dangerous plan, he continues:—

'As though for a civil war already begun, the field-marshal or general commanding-in-chief was supported by a well-chosen staff, with an

organisation which he always maintained upon the footing of a headquarters' camp, having under him his adjutant-general, his quartermaster-general, his military secretary, his host of efficient though subordinate officers, his aides-de-camp personally attending him, his cavalry orderlies waiting to fly off at a word with despatches; and, whether importing a vow to "have it out with the damnable Parliamentarians," or for some other less warlike purpose concealed from inquiring civilians, there sat all day in alcoves, open only on the side of the street, two ponderous troopers on horseback, riding each about twenty-two stone, who eternally, steadily, cheerfully looked across the gay road at Whitehall towards the site of the historic scaffold.'

This allusion to the mounted sentries at the Horse Guards has cost us a great deal of anxious reflection. It seems intended for a joke: yet we are afraid to laugh at it lest we should be guilty of treating with unbecoming levity a real danger to the Constitution. The waiter in the 'Antijacobin' startles us with the announcement that he is 'no waiter, but 'a Knight Templar.' Perhaps the presence of sentries at Whitehall may be something quite different from what we have always considered it. We thought them a harmless exhibition of military parade; but it seems that we must regard them as an insidious device of the 'personal sovereign' against our liberties.

We are told (p. 22): 'The "personal king" (in late times) 'having never been suffered to handle a complete war department himself, was yet always unhappily strong enough 'to prevent the genuine "state king" from having one in his 'stead.' Again (p. 68), we find allusion to 'the quite legal, 'quite grotesque doctrine, that our army, like the perquisite 'of a cook, was a thing coarsely owned by the "personal" as 'distinguished from the genuine "state" sovereign.' Again (p. 77): 'The army had been, altogether in theory and largely 'in practice, a Royal appendage belonging to the "personal ' "King." And again (p. 90): 'The expedient of dividing 'the control of our army between the sovereign and the 'sovereign's Government continued' till our own times.

Mr. Kinglake goes so far as to say (p. 25): 'The Horse 'Guards in peace time kept all our institutions, including 'what men call our "Government," at the mercy of force, at 'the mercy of royal whim, at the mercy of royal treason;' and he declares that the artillery was the only branch of the army which was not a menace to liberty, because the clerk of the ordnance was a member of the Government. Even that safeguard was insufficient, for 'a king who was a traitor at heart, and intended to undertake civil war . . . would, perhaps, send a company, or a corporal's guard, to drive in or

‘capture the outpost which the “Government” kept at the ‘ordnance.’

The argument amounts to this: The Horse Guards is commanded by the King in person, and, in consequence of royal aggression long and unwisely left unchecked, it is unconstitutionally removed from the control of Parliament. This control of the sovereign over the troops is of so dangerous a nature theoretically, and so destructive of good organisation in practice, that owing to it our army broke down in the Crimea. ‘The ‘simple truth is,’ says Mr. Kinglake, ‘that the Monarchical ‘part of our system had so cumbered the action of England, ‘as to prevent her from wearing the harness required by ‘modern war.’

These quotations might be indefinitely multiplied. The antithetical juxtaposition of ‘personal King’ and ‘state ‘King,’ both accentuated by inverted commas, becomes one of those catch-words of which Mr. Kinglake makes such merciless use.* The passages we have selected illustrate the three points upon which Mr. Kinglake insists; viz. the reality of the personal power of the Crown; the danger to liberty which thence arises; the confusion which paralysed our war administration in consequence of the interference of the personal sovereign.

Now we venture to say, in direct opposition to Mr. Kinglake, that none of these positions are tenable. The Crown has never—we speak of course of modern days—interfered with the army except by the constitutional means, that is, acting through and by its responsible advisers. Mr. Kinglake asserts that the Constitution unwisely left to the Crown a power which is dangerous to the Constitution, and that this power was exercised by the Crown in a manner to cause danger. This we entirely deny. The Crown had no such power, and consequently there was no such danger.

Authorities, from constitutional history and ancient usage, can be referred to in profusion to prove what we say. If Mr. Kinglake had turned to so easily accessible a text-book as Clode’s ‘Military Forces of the Crown,’ he would have found two chapters which should have kept him right.† If he were

* Within the first hundred pages the reader finds it repeated on pp. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28 bis, 30 bis, 55, 57, 67, 68, 73, 76, 77 bis, 78, 79, 83, 85, 86, 87 three times, 90 bis, 91, 92. Those who will examine these pages will see how completely Mr. Kinglake elects to rest his whole argument on the antagonism between the ‘personal’ and ‘state’ King.

† Chap. xxv. On the Office of Secretary of State; chap. xxvi. On the Office of Commander-in-Chief.

minged to search a little further, Lord Palmerston's elaborate paper, 'Upon the Office of Secretary at War with reference to the General Commanding-in-Chief,' though it upsets his theory, would have set his mind thoroughly at rest. He would also find a mine of information in Sir James Graham's Select Committee of 1860, on 'Military Organisation.' This Committee went at large into the question of the relative positions of the Secretary of State and the Commander-in-Chief. The report of their investigations, and the evidence on which it was framed, no less than Lord Palmerston's minute, are so clear that Mr. Kinglake's theory cannot stand for a moment against them. Mr. Clode's book is so easily accessible that we will not make any citation from it. Nor will we borrow more than half a dozen lines from Lord Palmerston: but these lines are such as to settle the question. Lord Palmerston, after stating that he has examined with great care the records of the War Office from the earliest times, says that 'from that time (i.e. the time of Charles II., 1688) downwards, there is no instance of any warrant or order, signed by the King, being countersigned by any military officer, but always by the Secretary at War, a Secretary of State, or the Lords of the Treasury.'

What, then, becomes of the Horse Guards chief, who is 'allowed to advise the King behind the backs of his Ministers'? The King has, at all times of our history since Charles II., acted through his ministers alone, and not through his 'Horse Guards.' But perhaps Mr. Kinglake might urge that Lord Palmerston's minute is out of date, and that between 1811—the date of Lord Palmerston's State paper—and 1870 irregularities crept in. He, indeed, expressly says that Mr. Cardwell's Act of 1870 materially changed the position of affairs, and—

'... down to even a period so late as the year 1872, the part of our constitutional polity which applies to this delicate subject, was only forming, not formed.'

'The Act of Parliament,' he adds in a note, 'bearing on a part of this subject passed in 1870, but the Orders in Council required were some of them of later date, and the change was hardly complete till 1872.'

Anyone reading this passage would imagine that some change in the relations between the Crown and the Parliament as regards the control of the army, some curtailment of the power of the personal sovereign, was embodied in the Act of 1870 and the Orders in Council here mentioned. But such is not the fact. No one will contend that the abo-

lition of purchase in the army, which is the main provision of the Act of 1870, touched the point whether the Crown could act without the responsible advisers of the Crown. As for the Orders, they are three in number, and as nearly as possible identical in terms.

The first was 'for defining the duties of the Field-Marshal commanding the forces, under the letter of service issued to him, by her Majesty's direction, by the Secretary of State for War.'

The second provides 'that one of her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State may from time to time appoint, and at his pleasure remove, an officer to be styled the Surveyor-General of the Ordnance.'

The third is a similar request 'for the appointment, by a Secretary of State, and removal at his pleasure, of an officer to be styled the Financial Secretary of the War Office.' Here then is no new thing such as Mr. Kinglake would have us believe. The first of the Orders in Council merely defined a previous relation between the Commander-in-Chief and the Secretary of State, without altering its character; and the two others created subordinate offices holding under and at the pleasure of the Secretary of State.

The Letter of service referred to in the first order was signed fourteen years before, in 1856, and still remained in force: by it the Commander-in-Chief, as all his predecessors before him, had been bound to act under the Secretary of State. Lord Panmure told Sir James Graham's Committee on Military Organisation,* 'If there were anything in the conduct of the Commander-in-Chief which required the interference of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of State has not only the right, but it is his bounden duty to interfere;' and again, 'The Secretary for War, and through him the Executive Government, is responsible for all the acts of the Commander-in-Chief.'

Lord Hardinge† told the Civil Administration Committee of 1837, that when Sir Herbert Taylor, Military Secretary to the Duke of York, was returned to Parliament for Windsor, Lord Liverpool or Lord Castlereagh sent to him to beg him not to interfere in the discussion of army estimates, that 'by ancient custom and usage that duty had been delegated to the Secretary at War, who, aided by the Judge Advocate General in the House of Commons, was the mouthpiece of

* Report, p. ix.; also questions 445 and following.

† Clode, 'Military Forces of the Crown,' vol. ii. p. 343.

‘ the Government to sustain any attacks that might be made ‘ upon the Commander-in-Chief or his office.’ Earl Grey, too, told the Army Organisation Committee * that the Duke of Wellington, when Commander-in-Chief, over and over again held this language to me, ‘ I think such a thing should be ‘ done. The Government must decide. The Government ‘ are responsible. They must signify to me her Majesty’s ‘ pleasure. Whatever they order shall be done.’

These are modern instances; we will add one of older date, to show that the tradition is uniform and complete. In 1740 the Duke of Argyll, notwithstanding great military services, had been dismissed, from political reasons. He raised a debate upon the condition of the army. It was suggested that the Duke’s observations reflected on the King.† The Duke at once rejoined that ‘ he imputed no part of the errors committed ‘ in the regulation of the army to his Majesty, but to the ‘ ministers whose duty it was to advise him, and whom the ‘ law condemns to answer for the consequences of their coun- ‘ sels.’ These instances cover the whole ground, from the time of Charles II. to the Crimean War.

The Commander-in-Chief holds his office by a Letter of service from the Secretary of State, to whom he is responsible. The Secretary of State holds his appointment by patent, which ‘ give and grant ’ to the Secretary of State ‘ the administration ‘ and government of our army and land forces of every kind, ‘ . . . excepting always so far as relates to . . . the military ‘ command and discipline of our army . . . and . . . appoint- ‘ ments to and promotion in the same.’

Notwithstanding these reservations, the Commander-in-Chief invariably obtains ‡ the sanction of the Secretary of State, with respect to commands-in-chief, and the giving away of regiments and promotions, previously to submitting them to her Majesty. First commissions are, as a matter of course, countersigned by the Secretary of State. ‘ In case of a ‘ difference, which has not yet occurred, the decision must ‘ rest with the Secretary of State, because in the constitutional ‘ form, the Secretary of State would advise her Majesty to ‘ take his opinion, and not that of the Commander-in-Chief, ‘ and thus the matter must finally be decided by the responsible ‘ minister.’ §

* Qy. 5329.

† Parl. Hist. ii. 913.

‡ Army Organisation, Duke of Cambridge’s evidence.

§ Do. Qq. 3889 et seq.

These authorities effectually dispose of all the nonsense, or worse, which Mr. Kinglake has written about the personal King 'having it out with the damnable Parliamentarians,' and the Commander-in-Chief having to take his orders from 'the King—the actual personal King'—behind the backs of Ministers. The alleged independence of ministerial control attributed to the Horse Guards does not exist. But that is not nearly all that can be said. If ever a reference to Lord Macaulay's omniscient schoolboy be admissible, it is surely here. Every schoolboy knows that no soldier can be maintained in England whose pay is not voted by Parliament. From the Commander-in-Chief to the privates and drummer boys, all are numbered, the numbers of them annually submitted to Parliament; the cost of their pay and maintenance estimated, submitted, and voted, and a special Act of Parliament is annually passed to authorise keeping on foot the number agreed to. Not only can no soldier be recruited, drilled, or equipped without the express sanction of Parliament, but no officer, not even the King acting by himself (or through his Commander-in-Chief), 'could order a corporal's guard to move from London to Windsor without going to the Secretary at War for authority.*' The 'personal sovereign,' in Mr. Kinglake's sense, is a purely imaginary personage.

We were greatly puzzled at first to think how Mr. Kinglake could have constructed, and defended at great length and in perfect good faith, a theory so easily refuted. But on page 29 of this volume we find a letter transcribed by Mr. Kinglake from Lord Raglan's papers, which explains the mystery. The whole theory is founded on a mistake—a mistake from which a single direct inquiry would have saved him. The letter of which we speak was one dated April 9, 1854.

'It began by apprising him that the Queen had been graciously pleased to appoint him to command a detachment of the army to be employed upon a particular service, and then at once handed him over to his country's Parliamentary sovereigns, by enjoining him to carry into effect such instructions as he might receive from (her) Majesty's ministers.'

'This change of masters, undergone by a general on being appointed to a command in the field, was pointed out to him by the chief at the Horse Guards in a document of time-honoured form, which men called the Letter of service.'

* Answer of the Duke of Wellington to a question put by the Army Commission of 1837.

(P. 29.) It was by a Letter of service in this form, as Mr. Kinglake tells us in a note, that Sir Arthur Wellesley was despatched upon particular service to the Peninsula in 1809; and in 1815 the same commander, then Duke of Wellington, was placed under the orders of 'her Majesty's Ministers,' with a view to the war in Flanders. Lord Raglan's Letter of service, he says, was dated April 9, 1854, 'and with the substitution of Queen for King, and "her" for "his," was 'exactly in the same form' as that addressed to the Duke of Wellington.

From this letter he has elaborated the theory which animates his volume. He accounts for the change of masters, as he calls it, and the transfer of a general from the immediate control of the King to that of the King's ministers, as follows:—

'Our people calmly endured this anomalous state of things' (the royal power exercised over the army during peace), 'but no English sovereign has judged that the prerogative represented at the Horse Guards could be suffered to use its power freely in time of war, for all saw that the ministers (through whom means of fighting would have to be obtained from Parliament) must be the men held to account for the conduct of any military operations undertaken by the State, and that along with the burden there must be corresponding power. Accordingly . . . there was but one way in which the prerogative exerted at the Horse Guards could be—even partly—preserved, and that was by throwing it into abeyance so often as occasion required. . . . So upon the whole there resulted a compromise between the Crown and the "Government," which was from time to time renewed, and almost, one may say, continued as an accepted tradition.' (p. 28.)

The Sovereign in peace time may thus treat the army as a personal possession, because in peace time he could do no practical harm. But in war time it was a totally different thing. Then the Sovereign gave back the powers wielded by him during peace into the hands of his Ministry, who, acting on behalf of the people, could no longer allow him to use a weapon which had become dangerous.

Unfortunately for this brilliant theory, it rests upon no ground whatever. The letter which is quoted so solemnly, and on which so much is made to depend, is not a 'Letter of service' at all. We give in a note* the 'Letter of service'

*

'War Office, April 1, 1854.

'My Lord,—The Queen having been pleased to appoint your lordship to serve on a particular service with the local rank of general upon the staff of the army, with a military secretary, four paid aides-de-camp,

which was actually sent to Lord Raglan. It is dated April 1, and is signed by the Secretary at War.* The letter quoted by Mr. Kinglake is a private letter from the Commander-in-Chief; it is dated eight days later. The real 'Letter of service' comes not from the Commander-in-Chief, but from the Secretary of State for War. It makes no mention of obeying the orders of her Majesty's Ministers, because the general appointed has never obeyed anyone else. The Letter from the Commander-in-Chief, quoted by Mr. Kinglake, might be lost in the post or twisted up into pipe-lights without any evil consequences. It is written according to the form set forth in Mr. Kinglake's text, and is always sent, according to ancient precedent, but it is, in fact, nothing but a courteous intimation, on the part of the 'general officer commanding the 'troops in Great Britain,' to one hitherto under his direct orders, that he has been appointed to detached command. It is not, we believe, even copied into the Commander-in-Chief's official letter book. The real 'Letter of service,' on the other hand, signed by the Secretary of State, is, and always has been, the warrant on which the officer addressed depends for rank, pay, and authority. Without it no general could take up his command, or perform any military act. The Commander-in-Chief himself has one, signed by the Secretary of State (this alone would dispose of Mr. Kinglake's theory), and so has every general exercising a foreign command. All that Mr. Kinglake says about 'the change of masters to which 'a general became subjected, when accepting a command in 'the field,' is a figment of his own brain. The King's surrender of his command over the army in war time is equally imaginary. The power of the Crown is the same, no more and no less, in peace and in war. Mr. Kinglake's idea (p. 29), that 'this contrivance (of letting the sovereign command 'in peace time and resign during war) bore the true English 'stamp, being visibly, overtly resultant from opposed volitions,

and four extra unpaid aides-de-camp, I am commanded to acquaint your lordship that it is her Majesty's pleasure that you do obey such order as you shall receive from her Majesty, the General Commanding-in-Chief, or any other your superior officer.

'I have, &c.

(Signed)

'SIDNEY HERBERT.

'Lieut.-General the Lord Raglan, G.C.B. &c.'

Lord Raglan had subsequently a commission from the Queen, in a form not always sent to a general, signed 'Palmerston.'

* The office of Secretary-at-War was abolished on June 9, 1854, and a Secretary of State for War created.

‘trying hard to endure coexistence,’ and so on, follows suit with the rest.

It is really difficult to say how large a portion of Mr. Kinglake’s four chapters falls to the ground with the explanation of his unlucky mistake about the Letter of service. It is almost a pity that, on some day during the last six-and-twenty years, he did not pause on his way to the club, and ask one of the clerks at the War Office to show him the form of a ‘Letter of service.’

To show that we do no injustice to Mr. Kinglake in believing this mistake about the Letter of service to be the sole authority on which he rests his theory of the duality and antagonism of the ‘personal’ and ‘state’ sovereign, we may mention, that although he asserts as a fact that such antagonism exists, he offers no evidence whatever to support his assertion. He is content to take it as proved by the letter which he has mistaken for the formal Letter of service. But since the real Letter of service is signed by the responsible minister of the day, the evidence on which Mr. Kinglake relies proves just the opposite of what he declares. It proves conclusively that, in peace time as well as in war time, the King exercises exactly the same kind of authority, and in exactly the same degree. In both the army is commanded in the name of the sovereign, by the advice of the minister. If a bad or corrupt appointment were made, it would show, not that the King was violently straining his prerogative, but that he had an incompetent or pliant minister. And this is nothing new. At the time of the Crimean War, and for nearly two hundred years before it, the power of the minister was just as absolute as it is now. All communications, except as to discipline and finance, were addressed then to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, as they now are to the Secretary of State for War; and lest it should be supposed that the two reserved subjects constituted a departure from the rule, we must remember that ‘Discipline’ has always been carried on under an Act passed every year by Parliament, viz. the Annual Mutiny Act, and Finance is directly under the control of the Treasury. There was therefore no room for the personal King at all, except so far as this: that being one of the three estates of the realm charged with administering the army, and being the one of the three in whose name all acts were done, the connexion between the King and the army was more prominently before men’s eyes than that between the army and Parliament. The responsible minister had a direct power over the regiments in England in peace time as well as in war. He actually exercised that

power, for instance, when a general election took place in a garrison town. It was the Secretary of State who gave a direct order to the officer commanding the regiment to confine the troops to barracks.

The power of the Crown was not greater because his name was prominently put forward in army matters. Personal loyalty to the sovereign no doubt comes in, and operates with admirable effect. Many a man has willingly died, and more, no doubt, will die, for Queen Victoria, who would not be very anxious to die for her ministers. But is that a danger to the State? is it not rather a safeguard? The power of the Crown is so hedged in that the personal attachment which is lavished on the occupant of the throne does not increase his authority, though it may add to his popularity. The English Constitution is full of anomalies—compromises, for the most part, between various estates of the realm which have been at some time or other in collision. Theoretically, these compromises look awkward, and it is easy for a rhetorician to make them appear absurd. But in practice they work well, for they all proceed on the assumption that a constitutional king, ruling over a free people, will respect their rights, and be treated in return as if he possessed a certain modicum of common-sense. No doubt, if all the estates of the realm were to push their rights to the uttermost, they might bring the State machine to a standstill. It did not need Mr. Kinglake's History to prove that dangers would ensue if every constitutional fiction were pushed to its logical consequence. We hear of the King's highway and the King's taxes, but no one supposes that the King spends the highway rates, or stands between the Treasury and the taxpayer.

It is really difficult to restrain a feeling of impatience at Mr. Kinglake's credulity, when we find him labouring with all the artifices of rhetoric, alternately indignant, sarcastic, and pathetic, to work up our feelings against this purely mythical 'personal sovereign.' It reminds us of the story which is told of a spectator, who, seated in the gallery of the House of Commons, heard the members cry 'Divide, divide.' He learned, in answer to his indignant inquiry, that they were clamouring each for his share of the taxes, which were periodically brought in a bag into the lobby. It was evidently true, for he heard them cry 'divide,' and saw them troop into the lobby to share the spoil. And in like manner Mr. Kinglake, with the Commander-in-Chief's letter to Lord Raglan in his hand, has no room for doubt that the General was handed over from the personal king to the responsible minister.

The disjointed state in which the Crimean War found our war administration was caused by a state of things quite the reverse of royal interference. The paralysis which affected our army resulted from the multiplication of checks and counter-checks devised to protect the public from extravagance. These were so powerful in controlling the military authorities that they had to be swept away, to the great grief of Constitutional pedants, before the military machine could be made to work at all. The royal warrant could not get a single musket out of store without the counter-signature of the Secretary at War. If any power, therefore, was obstructive, it was not the power of the Crown.

We now turn from Mr. Kinglake as a man with a Theory, to Mr. Kinglake as a man with a Mission. Here again we find ourselves unable to agree with him. Five-and-twenty years have elapsed since Lord Raglan was laid in an honoured grave. His countrymen would fain remember of him only his virtues and his success. Men think of his memory with the tenderness due to one of England's worthiest sons, and a word against his true and chivalrous nature would be resented as untrue as well as ungenerous by all Englishmen. But when Mr. Kinglake supports his eulogy of Lord Raglan by coarse and violent abuse of those who in the course of their duty disagreed with him, justice to other reputations compels remonstrance.

The desire which animated successive statesmen to recommend themselves to the country by retrenchment in army expenditure, whether the economy was wise and safe or not, left us at the outbreak of war without even the traditions of an army system. The Commissariat, instead of being conducted by a regular service, was almost entirely a regimental affair. Each battalion made its own arrangements through its regimental quartermaster, and scarcely a trace was left of the organisation by means of which the Duke of Wellington succeeded in feeding his army in the Peninsula. Mr. Kinglake says truly enough, that while making haste to effect that extensive disarmament which was warranted by the return of peace in 1815, 'statesmen ought to have cherished and perfected the inexpensive machinery of a sound War Department, entrusting to it the management of such military business as might still be on foot, taking care to keep it practised and skilled in those administrative operations upon which troops depend for health, for life, for movement, for discipline, for skill—in one word, for power.' It is almost needless to add, that Mr. Kinglake, being as incapable of keeping the personal sovereign out of his pages,

as Mr. Dick was of keeping the head of Charles I. out of his memorial, accounts for the failure by his usual formula : ' Because peace had returned, the Letters of service expired ; ' and then coming out of abeyance the old royal claim to have ' the personal command of the army regained its baneful force.' But we have had our say about this, and, though the theory is so intertwined with Mr. Kinglake's argument as almost to defy attempts at separation, we shall endeavour in our further remarks to leave it unnoticed. The new Secretary of State had to collect the scattered departments from Pall Mall, from the Tower, from the Horse Guards, and from whatever abiding place each office may have found for itself. If they were not yet under one roof, they were at least placed under one control ; and the command was given to the Duke of Newcastle, who showed great administrative talent in making the new machine work smoothly. The most difficult parts to build up in a hurry were the Transport and the Commissariat. An elaborate system of check and counter-check, invented originally to secure economy, effectually prevented anything like rapidity of action. It was difficult to get men all at once out of a groove in which they had become accustomed to move, and the chief difficulty of the first War Minister was not want of power, or even of willing hands and brains to aid him. It was that old traditions had to be destroyed. Officials who had been accustomed to write in the language of diplomatic request or remonstrance to officials across the street, had to be taught that they must, as Lord Macaulay says of Mahrattas and Mahomedans, ' forget their mutual feuds in common subjection.' The misfortune was that there was no time for teaching : the War Office had to learn its business in the midst of a great war. It was wonderful how well it worked as long as the fine weather lasted. But, when the weather broke, the road from Balaclava was in a few days made almost impassable, and before long hard work, hunger, scurvy, and cold almost destroyed the gallant army so lately victorious. Then came the furious reaction in public opinion. The Ministry at home and the staff abroad were both equally condemned. The Government defended both themselves and Lord Raglan as well and as long as they could : but the public anger was too much for them. Ministers, as well as the rest of the world, were deluged with accounts from the camp, from officers of all grades, from ' own correspondents,' and even from adventurous travellers. Most of these were conceived in the language of complaint. But Lord Raglan committed one fatal error. He did not furnish the Minister at War with answers to the accu-

sations levelled against his staff and himself, and, maintaining what Mr. Kinglake calls a 'proud reserve,' he left the Government at home really powerless to defend him. We are aware that Mr. Kinglake denies this. He says:—

'Having before me the two folio volumes comprising Lord Raglan's despatches and private letters to the Duke of Newcastle, I perceive them to be abounding—richly, largely abounding—in that very information which Lord Panmure says "he cannot find." It follows that, as stated above, Lord Panmure did not carefully read, did not master the papers in question.'

It is perhaps sufficient to observe upon this that having, as he says, in these two folio volumes, ample means of meeting the charge against Lord Raglan, he does not use them. If such letters were written, why does he not quote from them? Mr. Kinglake does not quote from them; he resorts instead to personal abuse.

Lord Panmure, writing in the spring of 1855, when the troubles were nearly over, says in a private letter to Lord Raglan now before us: *—

'Had the Government had from yourself *one such despatch bay* as that which you have now sent me, they would have had more heart, as well as better ground, for maintaining the position of yourself and officers.'

Further on he says:—

'Let me point out to you wherein I conceive the whole difficulties of your case to lie. You must have long perceived that not only were you surrounded by a vigilant and inquisitive and not very friendly press, but a vast number of your own officers have been in the habit of openly criticising all that occurs in your camp in letters to their friends, which we hear daily quoted and hear daily read in Parliament. Your actions, nay, your motives have been attacked in the public prints, and your policy has been to despise those attacks, instead of giving to those who would have been too ready to use them in your defence the means of exhibiting their falsity or their perversion of facts. I must say for the Duke of Newcastle, that he was left by your own unhappy reserve, or by your contempt of those whom you considered your slanderers, without a word to say against the well-concocted and highly-spiced accu-

* Dated March 16, 1855. The letter was written immediately on receiving Lord Raglan's answer to the despatch of February 12, 1855, from which Mr. Kinglake, in his attack on Lord Panmure, quotes at length. The public despatch, which three days later followed this letter, is also copied by Mr. Kinglake. Being in possession of the private letters of Lord Raglan, he must have seen that we now print; but he does not notice the direct contradiction to his statement that Lord Panmure 'failed to read' Lord Raglan's letters. 'I searched the 'records of the office,' says Lord Panmure.

sations which were levelled at you. If he denied them, it was on no responsible authority : if he was silent, he increased the reproaches of both parties in the controversy.

‘I had no desire to embark in this complicated and most unpleasant controversy, to which I foresaw that the despatch of January 6 must lead. I was induced to succeed Newcastle in hopes of being able to do some good. Not I alone, but every member of the Government was assailed with loud complaints against you and your staff. The stormy public feeling was in its fury, and my difficulty was to guide it—to control it was beyond my power. I searched the records of the office for explanations to enable me to meet the attacks for the absence of a road between your camp and Balaklava, and I could find none. I tried if I could discover in your despatches any mention of your visits to camp which were denied, though you may not know it, from very many quarters of it. I could find no mention of them. One such report as you have sent me from Dr. Hall would have allayed anxiety as to the sick, but it was not to be found.

‘In justice to myself in undertaking my duties, nay, in justice to you, I resolved to embody the state of my feelings in a public despatch, and painful as was the process, it was done without any personal feeling against you, in order to elicit from you those explanations without which I could not carry on my duties.’

No Minister in his senses could write such a missive as this, if it had been open to the General to answer it by simply referring to former letters and despatches from himself—if Lord Raglan could have said, ‘You say that the Duke of Newcastle was left by my reserve without a word to say in my defence : read my letters of such a date, and you will find the information he required. You say you have “searched “the records of the office” for explanations to enable you to account for the absence of a road : read my despatch of ———, and you will find them. You say you were without information as to the state of the sick such as that now given by Dr. Hall : read my despatch of ———, and you will find it.’ Such a reply would have been conclusive. But Mr. Kinglake gives us no evidence (beyond the simple assertion quoted above) that such a reply was made or could have been made. Another point will occur to the reader of the letter. Everyone must see in it evidence of a kindly heart, and a most friendly personal feeling towards Lord Raglan.

No one, we think, can read the following sentence, in which Mr. Kinglake draws Lord Panmure’s character, without a feeling of regret.

‘Owing partly perhaps to a habit of meditating upon the attributes of his father, Fox Maule was mighty in his curses, not simply and gently accentuating thought with a “damn” like the shrewd, reflective Lord Melbourne, but arming himself with maledictions in an aggres-

sive spirit, as though he would somehow wreak his vengeance upon many a hecatomb for the usage he had received in his youth. Rough-tongued and rough-mannered in the midst of courteous people, he was formidably equipped for attack; but his resources in the way of defence were even more efficacious, for nature had so thickly encased him as to make his mental skin quite impervious to the delicate needle-points with which a highly-bred gentleness is accustomed to correct its offenders. With all his roughness and violence it would seem he had no base malignity, and was more, after all, the rhinoceros than the tiger of Palmerston's Cabinet.'

Surviving friends of Lord Panmure, and we claim ourselves to be of the number, may be allowed to contradict these charges. He did not habitually use foul language. If he was brusque in manner, he had the feelings and demeanour of a thorough gentleman. He was far from being 'thick-skinned,' and he was very kindly of heart. The only word of truth in this calumnious paragraph is that he 'had no base malignity.'

It is quite true that the relations between the Commander-in-Chief in the Crimea and the Government at home became in the latter days of Lord Aberdeen's Ministry, and in the early days of that of Lord Palmerston, very much strained. They did not think Lord Raglan was acting with sufficient vigour; they believed the blame to rest more on his staff than on himself; they would gladly have persuaded him to change some of those by whom he was surrounded. They may have been wrong: at any rate, not being the apologists of Lord Palmerston's Ministry, we do not propose to attempt the proof that they were right. All we say is, that in the earlier part of his volume Mr. Kinglake took infinite pains to show that the military ought to be entirely subordinate to the civil power. Such being his opinion, is he consistent with himself when he holds up the responsible civil head of the army to public execration—a milder word will not convey the truth—for no other reason than that he presumed to call in question the judgment of the general? 'Surely I may be permitted 'to question your judgment without calling in question your 'truth or your honour, both of which, be assured, are as 'precious in my eyes, and in those of your countrymen, as 'they can be in your own.' So wrote Lord Panmure* in a despatch quoted by Mr. Kinglake. The latter sees in the words 'a virtual though ill-fashioned retraction of the censured implied in the despatch of February 12.' We confess we see no retraction, though the words are in keeping with the kindly tone of the private letter quoted above.

* March 19, 1855.

A whole chapter in this volume is devoted to a description of what Mr. Kinglake calls 'a plot' on the part of the Government to force Lord Raglan to dismiss some of the staff by whom he was surrounded. If that be the right term for the deliberately formed and freely expressed opinion of the responsible Government of the country, it is true that such a plot existed. But he goes further; he hints in unmistakable terms that a 'power within the palace,' which the reader has no difficulty in identifying with that which Mr. Roebuck once designated as 'a power behind the Throne greater than the Throne itself,' conspired with the Ministry to keep back from the Sovereign information she ought to have possessed, and to inflict in her Majesty's name a censure on Lord Raglan which she had not been asked to approve.

The Ministry are fair game, though even against them an historian, careful of his reputation, would take care to be very sure of his facts. But when the Crown is, not obscurely, assailed, we cannot but feel that a boundary line, ill defined perhaps, but quite recognised among loyal Englishmen, has been overpassed. We therefore proceed to examine the case with some care. Without fatiguing the reader with quotations, we will set forth Mr. Kinglake's account of the circumstances which caused the Government to send the despatch of February 12, 1855—which, as he avers, was sent without the consent of the Queen—as nearly as possible in words collected from his own pages. It seems that down to the close of the year 1854, the relations between the War Minister and Lord Raglan were on a satisfactory footing. Then the state of the army, and the letters of the 'Times' correspondent, so roused public indignation that the Ministry became alarmed for their own safety. The Duke of Newcastle 'began to have 'the sensation of falling.' 'By blaming Lord Raglan, and 'condemning, nay, roughly displacing, the chief officers of the 'head-quarter staff, might he not disengage himself from the 'cruel fate of a minister held answerable for the sufferings of 'our army?' 'Might he not bring about a blissful accord 'between himself and the angry people, that—at least for a 'while—they might travel together on the same road with the 'great journal cheering them forward?' To do this, 'to get 'himself welcomed into the midst of the angry multitude,' he must 'troop with the accusing throng, and himself become an 'accuser.' This is Mr. Kinglake's case against the Duke of Newcastle. He asked for information which Lord Raglan had not given, and to do so is in Mr. Kinglake's eyes a grave moral offence. The Duke of Newcastle here disappears from

the scene, for as soon as Parliament reassembled Mr. Roebuck moved for the Sebastopol Committee, and the Government were defeated, and the Duke was omitted from the new Ministry. 'What cast a real shade on the memory of 'the Duke of Newcastle,' says Mr. Kinglake, 'is, not any 'administrative mismanagement of the graver sort, still less 'any slackening of energy, but his clutch, if so one may speak, 'at the generous, the thoughtful adviser, who, because also 'an accomplished administrator, as well as the commander of 'our army, had been able to do more than any other living 'man towards enlightening the Ministers' path.'

The new Ministry had at its head Lord Palmerston, and the War Minister was Lord Panmure. 'Should the new Ministry 'trust their general, or rather, should they bow their heads 'to the newspapers, and shamelessly turn against him?' They endeavoured to choose a middle course. 'They retained Lord 'Raglan in command, but then, also, they ignobly left him 'unshielded by any good word of theirs against his rampant 'accusers, and even themselves took part in hooting their 'absent general.' Mr. Kinglake declares Lord Panmure to be more pointedly answerable for the despatches addressed to Lord Raglan than his 'merely assenting colleagues;' he accuses him of 'frivolous, reckless injustice, not unmixed with 'absolute rudeness,' and says that he hastened to prove himself 'beyond measure submissive' to the 'Times.' 'He received his 'marching orders submissively from the sheets of the "Times," 'proceeded at once to obey them without giving other vent to 'his savageness than a comfortable oath and a growl.' Here we have again the same imputation of habitual coarseness of language, and in addition the suggestion of a mean subserviency which would be incompatible with any man's self-respect and would be disgraceful in a minister. The customs of society would prohibit such license of speech if the object of attack were living. Is it generous then to use it when the man against whom it is directed is dead? Not content with calling Lord Panmure 'a churl,' Mr. Kinglake commits, what we take leave to call the impropriety, of suggesting that the despatch which he wrote at the request and with the consent of all his colleagues was prompted by mental disease.*

Mr. Kinglake evidently feels that after this insinuation the reader's mind will be attuned to a proper consideration of the despatch written by Lord Panmure, in which he gave utterance to the complaint of himself and his colleagues.† Mr. Kinglake

* Page 329.]

† February 12, 1855.

gives the gist of the despatch: his readers will therefore have no difficulty in deciding whether it deserves to be so violently denounced. That which Mr. Kinglake calls 'censure' on Lord Raglan was, after all, only a reiteration of the complaint that he did not furnish the Government with necessary information. Of one thing we can assure Mr. Kinglake on the best authority. He is mistaken in saying that Lord Panmure was responsible for the despatch, and that his colleagues 'merely assented.' If the opinions recorded by Lord Palmerston, Lord Lansdowne, Lord Canning, Sir Charles Wood (now Lord Halifax), Lord Granville, Sir William Molesworth, and the Duke of Argyll, had been reproduced in the War Minister's despatch, that document would have contained a heavier indictment against Lord Raglan than the one which actually reached the Crimea.

That, however, with which we are now mainly concerned, is the charge, made in terms more indirect, but still unmistakable, that the despatch of February 12 was withheld from the cognisance of the Queen. The statement is contained in three pages which can hardly have escaped the notice of any reader of Mr. Kinglake; it begins on page 333 with the following words:—'At that time as now, there reigned in England a Queen; and the sternest of those who uphold constitutional principles will agree for once with the courtiers, will concede that such a despatch as the one of which we are speaking ought not to have left our shores without having first been submitted for the royal approval.' Mr. Kinglake goes on to say that in the preceding reign 'a private secretary of the experience and quality of Sir Herbert Taylor might have been expected to aid his royal master' by advising him to pause before acceding to the desire of the Cabinet to write to Lord Raglan in the terms of the despatch of February 12.

'Did the storm out of doors sound so loud within the walls of the palace, that no new Sir Herbert was found to utter or write some such counsel? . . . It will be well for the monarchy if any explorer of desks, any searcher of journals and diaries, shall at least be able to show that some official neglect, or some oversight or mistake in the palace, *intercepted the royal attention* to what I have called the pith of this egregious despatch, and that therefore the act of concurring in Lord Panmure's heedless words may happily prove to be one in which, though the State gravely erred, the Queen herself took no part.'

Those who know the relation in which the Prince Consort stood, in matters of official business, to the Sovereign, will have no hesitation in interpreting the meaning of this apologue of 'Sir Herbert Taylor.' Mr. Kinglake is surely a little hasty

in his imputations of blame to those whom death has removed from the possibility of reply. His words may cause pain to survivors, but hardly advance his case; for readers of the third volume of Sir Theodore Martin's 'Life of the Prince Consort,' who will take the trouble to compare the despatch of February 12 with the language of the Memorandum addressed by the Prince to the Duke of Newcastle * on Dec. 31, 1854, need no formal assertion that the Queen had grievously felt the sad condition of her troops, and that she actively concurred in the language of Lord Panmure.

'The reports from Lord Raglan as to the condition of the army,' writes Sir Theodore Martin,† 'were most meagre: his letters being silent as to the sufferings with accounts of which private letters, as well as newspapers, were teeming. From them it was impossible to learn what was wanted for the supplies and comfort of the troops, and the Government could therefore only act upon conjecture, and send out whatever they thought was likely to be required. Scarcely less meagre were the official returns, which were barren of the most essential information as to the numbers of the army available and not available for action, the provision made for their shelter, clothing, and food, the supply of horses and the means of transport.'

On the following page we read:—

'One of the first acts of Lord Panmure was to require Lord Raglan to furnish the information pointed to by the Prince. His language of February 12, 1855, is so nearly that of the Prince's memorandum, that it may be presumed to have been before him when he wrote.'

A few pages later we find an autograph letter‡ written about this time by her Majesty to Lord Raglan. If we consider the terms of that letter, and the evidence, *passim* in the same volumes, of what the Prince Consort called 'the Queen's and my entire union in public matters,' there can, we think, be no difficulty in deciding that Mr. Kinglake is not warranted in saying that anyone 'intercepted the royal attention' to Lord Panmure's despatch.

As to the want of energy which, as Mr. Kinglake complains, was attributed by the Government to Lord Raglan, it does not appear that they held him personally to blame. Their view appears to have been rather that he did not get the amount of work which might have been obtained by a sterner treatment of his subordinates, especially the chiefs of the Commissariat.

* Life of the Prince Consort, iii. 177.

† Ibid. iii. 176.

‡ Quoted, *ibid.* iii. 180.

Lord Raglan was at the time of the war an old man. It was not to be expected that he would be as active in the saddle as younger men. One of the complaints against him was that he did not, by his personal presence in the camps, inspire his troops. Mr. Kinglake replies that he did visit them, but that he went attended only by a single aide-de-camp, and in private clothes. Mr. Kinglake attributes this to his constitutional disinclination for anything like ostentation. We have been told by a Staff Officer in one of the highest commands at head-quarters, that he forbade the Divisional Generals to allow their men to turn out or cheer him if they chanced to recognise him in his rides. It may be thought that for any purpose of putting heart into the men by personal enthusiasm for the general, Lord Raglan might as well have remained indoors as ride out under such conditions: but such a matter is one on which a general must be left to use his own discretion, and Lord Panmure cordially acknowledged that Lord Raglan did not personally neglect his men. A more important question is whether he was right in his treatment of the Commissariat.

It is plain to those who attentively read Mr. Kinglake's present volume, that Lord Raglan treated Mr. Filder, and the department which he administered, not as a part of the service of which he himself was the immediate and responsible head. He did not look upon the Commissariat as the most vital and important part of his own personal duty, but rather as an independent command, responsible doubtless to him as the general, but not to be immediately and personally governed from day to day and hour to hour by himself.

Lord Albemarle, in his 'Reminiscences,' gives an anecdote which forcibly illustrates the view taken by the Duke of Wellington of the Commissariat duties of a commander.

'My impression is,' says Lord Albemarle in a letter now before us, 'that the conversation I allude to took place at Wellington's table, within the lines of Torres Vedras (1810), one of the most important periods of the great Captain's life.'

'At an early period of the Peninsular war a body of general officers were assembled round the dinner table of Lord Wellington. Military matters were discussed with much freedom. An officer present ventured to ask the Commander-in-Chief, upon whom, in the event of anything happening to his Lordship, the command, in his opinion, ought to fall. No answer was given, and the unlucky General thought that, in modern parlance, he "had put his foot in it." Later in the evening, Wellington delivered his verdict in favour of Beresford (afterwards Field-Marshal). An expression of surprise pervaded the countenances of the guests, as the reputation of that officer did not stand high among them as a "strategist." "I see," said Wellington,

"what you mean by your looks. If it were a question of handling troops, some of you fellows might do as well, perhaps better than he; but what we now want is some one to *feed* our men, and I know of no one fitter for that purpose than Beresford." *

This, if we may trust Mr. Kinglake, was hardly the view taken by Lord Raglan. Mr. Kinglake seems to think that the General's attitude to the Commissariat was properly that of a courteous colleague to one on whose good offices he was dependent, and whose feelings he was consequently bound to conciliate. Take for a single instance this sentence (p. 137):—

'So early as October 24 Lord Raglan began his endeavours to obtain fresh vegetables for our troops in sufficient abundance; and, not content with his pressing instructions on this subject to the Commissariat, he strove to find them the shipping with which to effect the importations; whilst, moreover—encroaching a little on Mr. Filder's department—he directed the commandant at Varna to send fresh vegetables by every vessel thence sailing.'

The Commander-in-Chief, whose primary duty it was to feed his men, 'encroaching a little' on the province of his subordinate, because he discharged so obvious a matter of business! No soldier could have written such a sentence. The wonder is that Mr. Kinglake, who for five-and-twenty years has been writing about soldiers, could do so. Again, on the next page (139), speaking of the issue of lime-juice to the troops:—

'The medical authorities did not know that they had this resource close at hand, or else did not at first see its value; for until Lord Raglan happily interposed—and by that time the scurvy (though not at first perfectly recognised) had already proved baneful to health and life—no steps were taken for issuing the juice to our soldiers as part of their daily rations. Lord Raglan's interposition, he adds in a note, occurred in this way. Having called for a return of the various goods in store, he found, when he saw it, that a large provision of lime-juice was included among them.'

The order for issuing lime-juice was dated January 29, 1855. By that time the worst of the winter was over, and the troops had died by thousands of scurvy. Lord Raglan, it appears, had never so far 'encroached upon his colleague' as to call for a return till then, and the discovery was made, and the return called for, after the receipt in camp of a peremptory demand on the part of the Government at home for information.† A comparison of dates will show that the

* Fifty Years of my Life, vol. ii. p. 231.

† Duke of Newcastle's despatch, January 6, 1855, received in camp January 28.

despatch in which this demand for information was made is dated January 6, 1855, and was received in camp the day before the order for the issue of lime-juice.

With regard to that part of the despatch in which Ministers demanded detailed information respecting the Commissariat, Lord Raglan wrote :—

‘The supplies and means of transport being duties entrusted to the Commissary-General, I have communicated that part of your Grace’s despatch which relates to those important branches of the service to Mr. Filder, who has sent me the statement in reply, of which I have the honour to enclose a copy. I confess that I have considered the deficiencies to be far greater than he admits them to have been, but as he proposes to prove his accuracy by returns which he will submit for your Grace’s information, I may be in error.’

This despatch of Lord Raglan greatly disappointed the Cabinet. One of them, in a note which was concurred in and amplified by the rest, expressed astonishment that Lord Raglan’s method of dealing with a matter which was in fact personal to himself, should be a simple reference to the officer whose department was attacked, and transmission of his answer without other comment than that he, the General in command, had thought the matter stood differently. Does he not see, wrote another, that this mode of answer signs his own condemnation? His answer, wrote a third, ‘leaves the blame more entirely on himself. It was not the duty of — and —, it was the Commander-in-Chief’s duty to see that *somebody* did it.’

Most of the diseases of the army arose from scurvy. Fresh bread during the winter would have saved hundreds, perhaps thousands, of lives. Baking ovens were ordered from England, and Mr. Kinglake complains that they were not sent. But it appears that the materials were at hand all the time. When Sir John McNeil and Colonel Tulloch went out to the Crimea as Commissioners, they found Russian ovens at Balaclava, and abundant materials for setting them up, which had lain there disregarded ever since the first occupation of the port. Sir John McNeil and his colleague arrived in the Crimea at the beginning of February. In their preliminary Report they write :—

‘We are not aware of any reason why soft bread might not have been baked at any time for the sick, and also for the army. The French army has been regularly supplied with fresh bread, and the erection of a sufficient number of ovens was not an operation involving any considerable expense, or requiring much either of skill or of time, if it had been undertaken by the proper public departments. But

there appeared to be an indisposition to make the attempt. There were bakers enough in the regiments to have worked many more ovens than were required to supply the whole army, and if these could not be spared from their military duties, there was no difficulty in procuring bakers from Constantinople. But it was understood that a floating bakery had been in preparation in England, and it was therefore considered unnecessary to do anything here.'

But we will say no more. We are not writing a history of the war; still less are we making an attack upon Lord Raglan. What we have wished to show is this: that Mr. Kinglake is not justified in attributing the despatches sent to Lord Raglan to base cowardice, or to any intention on the part of Lord Panmure to sacrifice the General for the purpose of saving himself. It is difficult to see how any Minister could without dereliction of duty refrain from acting as Lord Panmure acted. By the Constitution of England he was responsible for the army to his Queen and to his country. It was his duty to speak out. Cowardice would justly have been charged against him if under the circumstances he had kept silence, even though by speaking out he risked a wound to the feelings of a well-loved comrade. There is abundant evidence, in the correspondence between Lord Raglan and Lord Panmure, that good feeling continued between them up to the end of Lord Raglan's life. They had formerly been colleagues; they remained friends; and we believe that no man would have been more pained than Lord Raglan himself at the unbecoming acrimony with which Lord Panmure has been assailed.

- ART. X.—1. *The Land Question, Ireland.* No. 1: *Notes on the Government Valuation of Land in Ireland.* No. 2: *Confiscation or Contract.* Published by the Irish Land Committee, Dublin: November, 1880.
2. *Parnellism Unveiled; or, the Land and Labour Agitation of 1879–80.* By PHILIP HENRY BAGENAL, Barrister-at-Law. Dublin: 1880.
3. *The Irish World and American Industrial Liberator.* A Journal printed in New York: 1879–1880.
4. *Young Ireland: a Fragment of Irish History, 1840–1850.* By Sir CHARLES GAVAN DUFFY, K.C.M.G. London: 1880.

IN the autumn of 1879—a moment pregnant with important changes and events in public affairs—it became evident to any discerning politician that the questions arising out of the state of Ireland were those which would press most urgently on the Parliament and the Ministry of the future, and which would apply the severest test to the principles and the capacity of those who might ere long be called upon to discharge the duties of government. Yet, strangely enough, of this, the most important and difficult of all subjects to England as well as to Ireland, but little was said in the electoral campaign. Foreign policy, agricultural distress, extension of the franchise, and half a dozen other topics of the day, were placed in the front rank. If the subject of Ireland was mentioned at all, it was chiefly to repudiate on behalf of the Liberal party all connexion with the Irish Home Rulers; indeed, at Liverpool it appeared that an injudicious attempt on the part of Lord Ramsay to hold out some encouragement to the advocates of Irish autonomy contributed in no slight degree to the loss of the election. We ourselves, in this Journal, never shared this apparent indifference to the Irish question, or this unwillingness to face it. We were perfectly convinced not only that it was in Ireland and the treatment of Ireland that the chief difficulties of the future lay, but that in comparison with this question all the other subjects to which a momentary importance had been given sank into comparative insignificance. The late Administration, which was then still in power, appeared to us to have utterly failed to apprehend the gravity of the situation; and much of the evil which has since occurred may be traced to the weakness with which it was resisted in the first instance. Mr. Gladstone, indeed, is reported to have said on

March 31 that 'there existed on the other side St. George's Channel an absence of crimes and outrages and a sense of satisfaction such as had never been known in the previous history of the country;' and her Majesty was advised to declare in the speech from the throne, on the opening of the new Parliament, her reliance on the loyalty and good sense of her Irish subjects. Had these views been correct, they would have implied a singular tribute of approval and gratitude to the late Tory Government, which had brought about such flattering results; but no such tribute was deserved. It was false that Ireland was either peaceful or satisfied, loyal or rational: we held so then, we hold so still. The language of Mr. Parnell and his associates ought to have dissipated such delusions. But at that time the Irish question was presented to the notice of the British public chiefly in the form of an appeal for relief in a case of urgent destitution, caused by the failure of the crops in a remarkably bad season. The Duchess of Marlborough placed herself at the head of a benevolent fund, which she administered with real ability, and no doubt a large number of severe cases of distress were relieved by these charitable exertions. The destitution of the Irish people, however, happily never sank in 1879 to anything like the point it reached in 1846 and 1847; the scarcity was limited in extent; in many counties it was not more felt than in England; but it was enormously exaggerated for the purposes of political agitation and social repudiation. The peasantry began to be deeply moved by a systematic agitation which addressed itself at once to their passions and their interests; and the attitude of the Irish National Party in the House of Commons (soon to be considerably reinforced at the approaching general election) left no doubt on our minds that we should shortly have to witness another of those crises which have periodically affected the relations of Ireland and Great Britain for several centuries. Animated by this conviction, we published in January of last year an article on the state of Ireland, which stated in detail all we had to say on the subject from an Irish point of view. That article was written by an Irish gentleman, inferior to none in patriotic attachment to his native country, in accurate knowledge of her real wants, in enthusiastic sympathy with her prevailing form of religion, and in the desire to promote her welfare. If it be not too late, we would again ask our readers to look back to some of those eloquent and monitory pages. It is not our present intention to repeat anything that was said on that occasion. But it appears to us that we may contribute something to the discussion of these

all-important questions if we endeavour to show how they may be approached and considered from a Scottish or British point of view. We are in reality much more impartial judges of the matter than the Irish suppose. We are conscious of no passion, no resentment, no ill-will in dealing with it; and in the common interest of the United Kingdom and the Queen's authority we are as desirous as the warmest Irish patriot can be to promote the peace, welfare, and content of that island.

Indeed, we must protest, at starting, against one of the most absurd and monstrous of the falsehoods and calumnies propagated amongst the people of Ireland by their treacherous guides, namely, the assertion that Great Britain, the British Parliament, the British nation are indifferent or hostile to the progress and welfare of Ireland. That radical untruth is the foundation of a thousand other misapprehensions and of bitter hatred. We reject it with scorn and indignation. What! shall we, whose forefathers have raised this island to the pinnacle of greatness, and who have in our own generation spread the name, and laws, and dominion of Britain over the furthest regions of the globe, calling into existence nations as free and as prosperous as ourselves—shall we grudge to the island nearest to our own coasts and inhabited by the people most nearly allied to ourselves, a full share of the blessings Providence has bestowed on this country? God forbid. We know what we owe to the genius and energy of Ireland. It has given a Wellington to our armies, a Palmerston to our councils, a Wellesley and a Lawrence to India, a Burke and a Sheridan to the House of Commons, a crowd of intelligent contributors to our literature, a crowd of busy labourers to all the industries of the people. The mingled strength, spirit, and tenacity of this nation are due in no slight degree to the blended influence of the English, Irish, and Scottish characters, and certainly Ireland is not the least brilliant sister population. The Irish have shone more in this and other countries than at home. Not for the interest and welfare of Ireland alone do we desire her progress and prosperity, but for the sake of England also, for the United Kingdom. The lawless condition of the people of Ireland, the obstructive temper of her representatives, the fatal consequences of political agitation to all branches of trade and agriculture, are not only ruinous to Ireland, but shameful to ourselves. The time of Parliament is consumed in vain attempts to remedy grievances which are aggravated by those who complain of them; the principles of government and of public economy are strained and distorted to give relief to men who turn even food and physic to poison.

The Irish are fond of harping on ancient grievances, but, thank God! they have now to go some distance back to find them. They are carrying on an irreconcilable war with the phantoms of the past. We are not concerned to deny that there have been many events and many legislative measures in the relations of England and Ireland which this country must deeply regret. She has shown the sincerity of her contrition by vigorous efforts to redress those wrongs and to efface the memory of them. We affirm with absolute confidence that for the last half-century, from the date of Catholic Emancipation, it has been the earnest desire and the unceasing effort of every English statesman to promote the peace and prosperity of Ireland, to treat her with the utmost liberality and something more than justice, to extend the education of the people, to develop the natural resources of the country, to allay, if possible, the baneful fires of religious animosity and intolerance, and assimilate her to the other portions of the United Kingdom. It is an obvious truism that Ireland in a depressed and disaffected condition is a weak spot in the panoply of England; but that Ireland prosperous, populous, and contented, would add at least one-third to the strength of Britain. Probably at this moment she subtracts about an equal proportion of strength from it. England asks of Ireland no subjection, no surrender of her national character, which may remain as untouched by the Union as the national character of Scotland has done, no self-abasement, but, on the contrary, a frank alliance, to which are annexed all the privileges that belong to the greatest empire on the face of the earth. We will not say with what ingratitude these efforts have been repaid, with what a jaundiced eye every benefit conferred by England has been looked at and received. But we assert that the history of the last fifty years is an ample and complete vindication of the policy of England towards Ireland, and that to go back to earlier times in search of grievances and wrongs which have long ceased to exist, is a mere exercise of gratuitous malignity. Are the Irish to disclaim all connexion with this country because the articles of the Treaty of Limerick were not faithfully kept, or because the Irish Parliament which passed the Act of Union was signally corrupt? Corrupt it may have been, but that Act at least was a wise one.

It must be admitted that if the balance of the account between England and Ireland had been struck at the close of the last century, a large debt of justice, toleration, and commercial freedom was then due from this country to that; though it

cannot be forgotten that harsh and intolerant as the policy of England may have been to Jacobite and Catholic Ireland, no country ever made more rapid progress than Ireland from the savage state in which James II. left her in 1691 to the Ireland of 1782, when she rose to the most brilliant period of her social condition, and obtained from England the perilous gift of legislative independence. But if, on the contrary, the relations of the two portions of the United Kingdom be fairly measured by the transactions of the last fifty years and by their present condition, the balance of obligation has been thrown on the side of Ireland, and it will be shown that she is not the victim but the spoilt child of the Imperial Legislature. All distinctions of religious inequality before the law have been swept away; if any vestiges of them remain, they are due not to England, but to the bigotry and intolerance of Irish sects. The principle of an Established Church has been abandoned, and every religious body in Ireland has been secured from all connexion with the State, with what success time will show. We do not conceal our opinion that it would have been far wiser to attach the several churches more closely to the State, by an equitable division and application of the property now diverted to far other and baser uses; and we shall ever regret that the surplus revenues of the Church were not partly devoted to providing manses and glebes for the Catholic clergy. The great measure of 1868 was at least conceived in a spirit of liberality to Ireland, and involved some sacrifice of feeling and conviction on the part of this country, but we think it was hastily framed; that the details and provisions of it were ill-considered and in some respects unjust; and undoubtedly it contributed to shake the loyal attachment to the Union of the only party in Ireland who are really well affected to the British Crown. During the whole of this period Ireland has been more lightly taxed than Great Britain, some of our taxes not existing at all in that island, and others being levied at a lower rate. Large grants have been made year by year from the Imperial Treasury for the encouragement of Irish enterprises and improvements, not always of a remunerative character, which offer a striking contrast to the votes bestowed on our northern portion of Britain; * and in

* In the years 1875-76 the sums granted to the Imperial Treasury for education, police, and poor relief were, to Scotland, with a population of 3,360,018, the sum of 484,809*l.*; to Ireland, with a population of 5,411,416, the sum of 1,768,555*l.* See an article in this *Journal* (vol. cxlii. p. 330) on the Financial Grievance of Ireland.

times of famine and distress enormous sums and stores of food have been lavished on Ireland, which were only partially checked last winter, because the Irish leaders presented a rifle at us with one hand whilst they tendered the begging-box with the other.

England contributes to Irish education, which has been established on a vast scale, and to the Irish police, besides the military forces required to preserve peace in the country. And as for ulterior measures of improvement and reform, for which there is of course a continual demand in every civilised community, it is a fact that the British Ministry and the British Parliament are eagerly desirous to adopt every measure which can be shown to be based on sound economical principles, and which commends itself to the just judgment of enlightened statesmen. He who would do more is none.

It is no doubt a painful and humiliating reflection that these efforts and sacrifices, which have been made in all sincerity and good will by the people of England, have been met, by a portion at least of the people of Ireland, with increased signs of malignant animosity. We say a portion, and we believe we might say a small minority, of the Irish people, for we are far from supposing that these noisy agitators, who speak the language of American rowdies and who are many of them outlawed felons acting from abroad, are the true representatives of Ireland. But these men are active and unscrupulous, and we shall presently see with what art they have possessed themselves of the mind of a credulous peasantry, and turned every constitutional right and every natural gift of Irishmen into a weapon of offence against England. But strangely enough, though their animosity is directed against England, their blows fall altogether short of that mark, and lash the backs of their own countrymen. They may excite feelings of disgust and anxiety on this side of St. George's Channel, but that is all. If rents are not paid, Irish society is robbed and impoverished; if landlords are shot, they are men as Irish as their assassins; if crops are not gathered and if cattle are houghed, the loss falls on Ireland; if crimes are unpunished and the country suffers all the evils of anarchy, it is their own work; if capital is driven away from Ireland, and works of improvement suspended, they must take the consequences of a reign of terror. The Irish agitators have inflicted on some parts of the country all the horrors of an interdict. They have borrowed the sentence of excommunication from the old annals of papal tyranny. All this is very cruel, but it is as foolish as it is cruel. These punishments

fall on the majority of their own countrymen. They will ultimately reach themselves, the authors of the evil. But they will certainly not intimidate England. They hardly touch the interest of any Englishman, except the small minority who may hold property in Ireland. Nothing can be more Hibernian than to inflict tortures on the Irish community for the purpose of wringing concessions from the British Parliament.

At each successive stage in this long and wearisome journey we have flattered ourselves that the panacea for Irish disaffection was at length discovered.

‘Has Hope, like the bird in the fable
That flitted from tree to tree
With the gem from the Prince’s table, —
Has Hope been that bird to thee?’

Catholic Emancipation, to go no further back, was to establish for ever on the basis of justice the equal rights of the Irish Catholic population. All restrictions on trade were most justly removed, and Ireland found here an inexhaustible market for her produce, which is now said to be one of her grievances. Irishmen and Catholics were freely admitted to all the offices in the Empire. An especial Court was provided to clear encumbered estates; large quantities of land were sold at low prices; capital was attracted by the promise of a Parliamentary title: but the holders of these very investments are now threatened with death if they ask for the interest on their capital, and indeed their tenants are equally threatened if they dare to pay it. The Protestant Church of Ireland has been disestablished in order to place all religious bodies on the same footing; but no sooner was this great act accomplished than we are told that this was a sentimental grievance, and that in abolishing the Protestant rectors we have only done away with the best man in the parish. A Land Act was passed in 1870, which went to the verge of communism, but it has only served to increase the appetite and the pretensions of the popular party.

We yield to none in our attachment to constitutional rights; but constitutional rights must be constitutionally exercised. There is no such thing as liberty without law, or liberty which sets all law at defiance: that is, on the contrary, the worst of tyrannies. The Irish agitators have shown a curious infelicity in turning every institution we value into a weapon of offence against society. Liberty of speech they make an incentive to crime; freedom of Parliamentary debate they pervert into obstruction; the liberty of the press becomes in their hands a means of inundating their own country with the garbage of

America; the means of education, which have been lavishly provided for two generations, serve only to place seditious publications in the hands of the peasantry, who in fact read nothing else; trial by jury becomes a mockery where the jury are either in league with the criminal class or else intimidated by a secret tribunal to pervert the course of justice. Vote by ballot has always appeared to us a very doubtful remedy for the evils of our own electoral system, and recent disclosures have not altered our opinion; but in Ireland we pointed out long ago that the consequences would be still more pernicious. That prediction has been amply verified; yet no doubt the ballot was readily extended to Ireland as a just and liberal measure, and there are some among our friends who would even now extend the Irish franchise.

All these things are in themselves very good. They are rights and institutions which we cherish. We have transplanted them to Ireland because we believed them to be equally beneficial there. But, if we may borrow a very common proverb, 'what is one man's meat is another man's poison.' We cannot carry our veneration for constitutional rights so far as to hold that it is better for a country to perish than for one jot or tittle of the law to be suspended. That is mere fetishism. Constitutional rights are established for the benefit of society. In this country they exist to a degree unknown in any other part of Europe, and they exist with great benefit to the people and the State; but our own experience tells us that they are not always equally applicable everywhere. We are informed that it has been found necessary to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act in Ireland twenty-one times since the Act of Union. We are sorry for it—sorry for the credit of the people of Ireland. But it is a thousand times better to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act than to let society fall into anarchy, or to oppress the best part of the community by the terrorism of the worst. That indeed is tyranny, and of the most execrable kind. Lord Grey's Act of 1833 gave enormous powers to the Lord Lieutenant for the repression of disorder—powers which Lord Wellesley, who then filled that office, described as much more formidable to himself than to the people of Ireland, because he was responsible for the exercise of them. Their existence was sufficient: they were seldom exercised, and the Lord Lieutenant desired in 1834 the partial repeal of them. But from the time of Lord Grey to the present hour the duty of the Ministers of this country appears to us under similar circumstances to be the same. Our conception of law and government is that the law being established

by a free Parliament, and interpreted by competent tribunals, and administered by responsible agents, it is the duty of Government to employ whatever means, ordinary or extraordinary, are required to enforce it, and, if the ordinary means do not suffice for that purpose, to extend them. To suppose that any citizen has an inherent right to set the law at defiance is an absurdity and a contradiction in terms. Every man living in the community is bound by it, and the community may justly apply its whole weight and strength by constitutional means to compel obedience. It is all important that the law itself and its provisions should be just and constitutional; but if that be the case, it matters comparatively little by what means it is enforced, and under some circumstances all means of enforcing it are constitutional. If the law be not enforced, men must take the defence of their lives and property into their own hands; society is thus dissolved in anarchy; and in order to uphold right existing under the law, the law itself is broken. At such times the consequences of inaction or tardy action are the subversion of social life and the ruin of a country. The refusal to pay rent cannot be confined in its effects to the landed class; it must soon annihilate all social confidence. The capitalist who has advanced money on Irish mortgages will not obtain his interest. The banks which have made advances on agricultural securities must withdraw them. The insurance offices refuse to insure life and property when both are exposed to extraordinary risks and perils. Credit will cease; and the moneyed classes, being reduced to poverty, will be unable to expend anything, and trade must be paralysed. These are not imaginary evils. They are actually occurring. We know of numberless instances of them. If they continued, they would bring about the absolute ruin of the country; and the greatest sufferers in the end would be the very class this revolution is intended to benefit.

This brings us to the point at which we now stand, and to the consideration of the latest demand of the Irish popular leaders—namely, what is vaguely termed the reform of the land-laws, by which is meant apparently a total subversion and change in the existing tenures of land. This demand has been preferred in terms which might fairly raise a presumption against it. It has been accompanied by direct advice to the people to break existing laws and violate existing contracts. It has been enforced by cruel and abominable crimes, calculated to establish a reign of terror in Ireland, and to visit with the penalty of death the simple performance of the most ordinary duties and obligations, such as the payment of rent. Whoever

may be the direct authors of these foul murders and base threats of murder, the primary guilt rests on those who have instigated them; and as the criminals are in every case concealed from justice by the connivance of the peasantry, large bodies of men are unquestionably accessories after the fact, sometimes before it. To which it must be added that the Roman Catholic priests, having a knowledge of the most secret thoughts of their flocks by means of the confessional, must themselves be cognisant of the nature and extent of the conspiracy against life and property, which, as far as we know, they have done nothing to prevent. They cannot of course disclose the secrets of the confessional, but they could use the knowledge they possess to compel the peasantry by the severest ecclesiastical penalties, which are dreaded in Ireland, to renounce this detestable complicity in conspiracy and murder. An Irish peasant who commits a crime (generally at the instigation of some secret society) relies for impunity in this world on the connivance and complicity of the people, and for impunity hereafter on the absolution he hopes to obtain from his clergy. He therefore confesses his offence to the priest, and escapes the sanction of all laws human and divine. Guilt may attach to individuals, but impunity of crime is the infamy of a nation.

With regard to most of the measures obtained from, and sanctioned by, the British Parliament, for the welfare of Ireland in the last fifty years, which are, as we have shown, sufficiently numerous, it may be said that they were in themselves wise and necessary, and that they obtained the cordial support of the most enlightened British statesmen. These measures have not succeeded in pacifying Ireland, because other causes of disaffection are at work; but they satisfied our own sense of duty, and applied principles which we believed to be just. The agitation for the reform of the land-laws, the abolition of existing relations between landlord and tenant, and the demands of the Land League, stand on very different ground. We believe the objects which the Land League avows to be absolutely pernicious and unsound in an economical point of view, and that if they were not impracticable and could be carried into effect, they would in less than half a century produce the most calamitous results to the people of Ireland. And here it may be observed that all legislation with reference to the tenure of land must be very slow in its operation: changes in the holdings of land and the modes of cultivation cannot be abrupt, even when they are brought about by a revolution, as in France. If existing

interests are to be respected or bought out, one or two generations must elapse before they can be extinguished. The results of a change in the tenure of land, be they for good or for evil, must always be remote, and can produce little or no effect on the present generation of peasantry or proprietors; nor can they suspend or alter the obligation to fulfil existing contracts. As a remedy for present evils, such changes are inoperative. The question of their future and ulterior effects is hypothetical; and these effects may be regarded from the most opposite points of view. We think it can be shown that the establishment of a large number of peasant proprietors in most parts of Ireland would produce results extremely unlike those which are anticipated by the promoters of such a measure.

The operations of agriculture have been carried on for centuries in this country, and in the most civilised parts of Europe, by a triple combination of the landlord, who provides the capital represented by the soil; the farmer, who finds the skill and the floating capital required to work it; and the labourer who supplies manual labour. Of these three the labourer is, in his degree, the most certain of a return; he has the first charge on the land; for he is paid his weekly wages, whether the operations of the year are remunerative or not. Next comes the farmer, who sells the produce and receives its value. Lastly, the landlord, who claims from the farmer interest at a low rate on the capital sunk in the land. Practically it might be said that the landlord lends the capital representing the value of the land to the tenant, at an interest of two and a half or three per cent. The advocates of a system of peasant proprietors virtually recommend that these three functions should be merged in one; that the holder or tiller of the soil should first sink the greater part of whatever capital he has in the purchase or redemption of the land; then employ what remains to him in stocking and manuring his farm; and, lastly, that he should cultivate it with his own hands or those of his family. This is the ideal of the man living under his own vine and fig-tree—paying no rent to any barbarous landlord, no wages to labourers, but sole master and worker of his own domain. No doubt there is something captivating in the picture, and we do not undervalue the moral influence which the sense of property and ownership has on man. The French peasantry are the most frugal and hardworking human beings we have ever seen in the world; they submit to privations and to toil unknown even in Ireland; but they do not always submit to them. We found last year in Picardy that twenty farmers were holding land under sixty landlords,

because the small proprietors prefer in many instances the rent of their plots of land to the labour of personal cultivation.

But now observe the effects of this state of things. If a man has sunk his capital in the purchase of a piece of land, he loses the interest on his money. If he has borrowed the capital, he probably pays high interest on the sum borrowed. Under another name this charge is equivalent, or superior, to his former rent. His capital being thus sunk, the portion that remains to work his farm will be small—yet everything is to be provided out of it: buildings, stock, manure, implements, drainage, seed, and sometimes labour. The probability is, that his means being less adequate, the result will be less favourable: in other words, the cultivation of the country will deteriorate or at least not advance. There are some kinds of culture, as that of the vine, and of fruit or vegetables in fine climates, which are favourable to small holdings and personal labour. But in Ireland, where the best profits are made on stock, dairies, and the cultivation of flax, nothing of the kind exists. What would be the fate of the small proprietor in bad years, which occur on an average once in three? He has no one to back him or help him. He grows his crops not so much for the market as for the sustenance of his family. The crops rot, and the family starves. Were such a state of things universal, there could be no rates in support of the poor, for there would be no rate-payers. Pressed by narrow circumstances and occasionally by want, it is impossible he should not have recourse to the money-lender and borrow on his land. That is the curse of France, the curse of India, the curse of every country where the peasantry are crushed beneath a load of debt. They have exchanged the landlord for the usurer. They pay a higher rate of interest, and the mortgagee becomes the real, they the nominal, owners of the soil. Suppose, on the contrary, that the small proprietor is the owner of what he farms, but has borrowed money to purchase it or to stock it on the security of his land, is the mortgagee not to foreclose and take possession if the interest on the loan is not paid? What is this but eviction for rent under another form? Yet without such security, all credit would be at an end, and no loans would be granted at all. The banks in Ireland are already beginning to find out that this agitation threatens their most useful and profitable agricultural operations.

But suppose the peasant proprietor installed in a holding of from twelve to twenty acres—less, it is admitted, will not support a family. In Ireland early marriages and large families are the

rule, and, with the habitual improvidence of the people, it is not probable that the growth of population would be checked by the motives and the means that prevail elsewhere. How is the family to be provided for out of the paternal inheritance, all of which is sunk in the farm? Either there must be squatting and subdivision of the land, or you must introduce the right of primogeniture—the very institution most detested by radical land-reformers. If you subdivide, you reduce the holding to a potato ground; if you preserve it as a farm, you leave the younger children unprovided for. In either case you create in two generations a nest of paupers.

The claims most eagerly put forward by the Land League are those of the small tenant farmers, of whom we are told about 600,000 exist in Ireland. This is an exaggeration. The whole number of agricultural tenants in Ireland is about 430,000, including large and small holdings. The present agitation has really sprung up amongst the poorest and most ignorant minority of this class. Fixity of tenure or absolute ownership of the land for these fortunate persons is the remedy for Irish ills. Why should they be thus favoured? The male agricultural population of Ireland is at least double the number of farms. There are labourers as well as farmers. According to the last census, there were in Ireland 444,729 agricultural labourers with their families at the mercy of the farmers who employ them. If an agrarian law were passed, they have equal rights to a share of the spoil. In fact, the holders of farms would then be in the position of landlords, and those who held land would be evicted by those who had none. The labourer would have no other means of subsistence, for as capital and the employers of labour are to be driven out of the country, and every man is to till his own field and own the field he tills, wages would cease, there would be nobody to pay them, and every man who had not the good fortune to possess a corner of the soil must perish. This is no imaginary source of alarm; the case is actually occurring. In consequence of the fierce threats of the Land League, many of the wealthier classes and employers of labour are leaving Ireland; in consequence of the non-payment of rent, those landlords who remain are obliged to restrict as much as possible their operations. Hence large numbers of agricultural labourers have been thrown out of work. The small farmers, who are ready to avail themselves of any pretext to crush those beneath them, have immediately taken advantage of this state of things to *reduce* the miserable wages they pay the labourers. The consequence is that while the small farmer

is clamouring for land, and refusing to pay for it, the wretched labouring class, equally numerous, or more so, is worse off than ever. No wonder that Miss O'Brien, who seems to know the people of Ireland, tells us that the hatred of the agricultural labourers against the small farmers is fiercer and bitterer than the hatred of the tenants against the landlords; and with reason, for the labourer is far poorer and far more harshly treated and oppressed. To throw the land of Ireland into the hands of the existing small tenants would be to perpetuate this tyranny. These and many similar considerations might be adduced to show that the proposals of the Land League, if carried into effect, mean simply a relapse from civilisation to the most barbarous tenures known to mankind—tenures adapted to a kraal of African or Tatar savages, but fatal to the prosperity and progress of a nation.

Attention has been directed to an essay on the subject of Irish peasant proprietorship by Mr. Tuke, who has recently visited the country to interrogate the purchasers of some of the glebe lands, and who is a strong partisan of the system. Mr. Tuke's observations result in this: that where a man has a good deal of energy, great industry, and some capital, he may prosper on a small farm purchased by himself, provided it is not less than eighteen acres, that it is not subdivided, that his sons do not marry, and that he has some other source of income. Of course, the men who have purchased these glebe lands were amongst the best of their class, for they had already saved money. To begin by borrowing at 6 per cent. is absolutely fatal. And even these men are at the beginning of a great experiment. But Mr. Tuke's statements have been met by a crushing reply from Mr. W. J. Sinclair, in a pamphlet entitled '*Irish Peasant Proprietors, Facts and Misrepresentations*,' published by Messrs. Blackwood, in Edinburgh. Mr. Sinclair demonstrates from minute inquiries on the spot that even in Donegal only *three* successful purchasers of glebe lands were found out of fifty-nine tenants, and these three were worse off than they had been before; that many other purchasers of glebe lands have been swindled and ruined by the usurers from whom they borrowed the purchase money; and that in the parish of Templecrone, which was referred to on a former occasion in this Journal, twenty-eight purchasers out of fifty got into the clutches of the local usurer. Of nine mortgagers in that parish who are still in debt to the Commissioners, Mr. Sinclair was informed that 'they had not paid their instalments for the past year, that some had never paid, and that none of them would probably ever pay again.' Our statements

on this point, which were impugned, are thus fully confirmed by Mr. Sinclair on further inquiry.

No class of men is entitled to more respect than those small farmers who have succeeded in purchasing land with money laid by or earned by their own industry and economy. Of these there are many in Ireland, because large quantities of land have been thrown on the market by the sale of encumbered estates at a low price, and they have been bought by small holders or speculators.* But these small holders and recent purchasers are necessarily sharp landlords. They have invested their money on the faith of a Parliamentary title, and they have every right to presume that they will obtain the proper interest of their investment. In fact, they cannot subsist without it. They therefore exact it when due. The small resident landlords, far more than the great absentee landlords, are driven to resort to the eviction of non-paying tenants. Many a farmer in Ireland holds land at a low rent, and sub-lets it at a much higher rent, exacting the last shilling from his tenants. Can the law interfere with these endless and complicated arrangements? Can it forbid men to let and sub-let, to buy and sell? Only by extinguishing the rights of property altogether, for these are of the essence of them.

If, then, the attempt to create a class of peasant proprietors by artificial means is open to grave objections on financial and economical principles, is it more defensible on the ground of political expediency? Would it remove a real grievance, extinguish disaffection, and allay discontent? We

* Lands to the value of 52,401,494*l.* (says the Irish Land Society in an excellent tract on the subject) have gone through the Courts established for the sale of landed estates in Ireland in the last thirty years, and have passed into the hands of purchasers who have advanced their money on a title created by the Imperial Parliament and guaranteed by the honour of the English people. In no country in Europe has so much land been sold within the same time, or sold so cheap—about one-sixth of the entire area of Ireland, averaging less than twenty years' purchase, calculated on low rents. By so much has the class of landlords been increased in numbers and the class of tenants diminished. By what conceivable claim is a purchaser of one of these farms, under a Parliamentary title, to be deprived of the right of cultivating it, improving it, or receiving rent from it? He has been encouraged by the State to invest his money in this land, and he is now told that his investment gives him no rights over it, the right of possession being in the occupants of the soil. It is impossible to conceive a more disgraceful fraud or paltry evasion of the first principles of the law of property.

think not. Whatever might be the efforts of the British Parliament, if it adopted the scheme of Mr. Bright, to transform large properties and reclaim waste lands, the number of persons who might be benefited by these changes could be but a small fraction of the rural population of Ireland. Those who obtained nothing would only be the more discontented, clamorous, and importunate, for they would have been taught the fatal lesson that agrarian crime is rewarded, not punished. It is an elementary truth that an act of generosity makes one ungrateful man and nine resentful. The consequence of legislative interference with the rights of property would be that those who profited by it would be far outnumbered by those who did not, and, like pauperism, the evil you propose to remove would be augmented by the means you take to remove it, and the general disorder and distress of the Irish people would increase. The next demand, which we see has actually been made at a Land League meeting, is that the whole 'rural population should be provided on easy terms with a 'suitable residence and a plot of ground.' The primary evils under which the rural population of Ireland suffers are redundant population and imprudent marriages, want of capital, a tenacious adherence to very small holdings of land insufficient to support life, a fervid hostility to improvement. All these evils would be increased by an extensive creation of small proprietors, and on purely economical principles we have the strongest conviction that no greater curse could be inflicted on the country.

We shall now proceed to examine the measures known as 'the three F's,' which are advocated by some of the less violent reformers of Irish land laws. What are they worth? The first of these proposed remedies is what is called 'fixity of tenure,' by which you would fix more closely to the soil the very class from which it is desirable to disencumber it, since the soil of western Ireland cannot enable that class of human beings to subsist. Fixity of tenure resembles in some degree the old system of leases on lives, once prevalent in the west of England, and only known now by its absurd and deplorable consequences. The object of fixity of tenure seems to be to give the tenant a right which he can hold against the true proprietor, and which he can mortgage or sell. It is, therefore, nearly allied to tenant-right. But what is the condition of an incoming tenant who has paid from ten to twenty years' purchase for his tenancy, besides the rent due to the landlord? The land has thus to bear two rents. It is precisely analogous to the heavy premiums sometimes paid for London

leases. Complaints are made of high rents: but the very men who make these complaints are the partisans of a system which doubles the rent to the incoming tenant, without putting another shilling in the purse of the landlord, whilst the outgoing tenant decamps with the profit and carries off half the value of the farm. If rents in Ireland are excessive (which they are not), how is a tenant to pay the heavy fine of tenant-right in addition to the fair rent of the land? But the moment you concede fixity of tenure, you create something which the tenant will sell or pledge in spite of the landowner. You create a partnership between two hostile interests, by which the one will be infallibly consumed and ultimately destroyed. The tenant would then become the landlord, and would be subjected in his turn to the same process of destruction by those holding under him. If this is the meaning of 'free sale,' it is as pernicious a thing as can be conceived. But if 'free sale' only means the right to purchase land, it is clear that there is no want of land to be bought in Ireland, provided there are buyers prepared to pay even a small price for it.

Free use has been made in the discussion of these questions of two well-known expressions, 'fixity of tenure,' and 'eviction.' It is worth while to consider what they mean, for they cannot be applied to the peasantry of Ireland in any other sense than that which they bear to the rest of the world. Fixity of tenure cannot be predicated of any human possession: there may be circumstances in which a man forfeits that which he might otherwise regard as absolutely his own. For instance, a man mortgages a freehold estate; the interest is not paid; the mortgagee forecloses; and the mortgagor loses his estate. As for the application of this term to the tenantry of Ireland, the absurdity of the attempt has been well pointed out by the highest authority. In the debate on the second reading of the Land Bill of 1870, Mr. Gladstone said on March 11, 1870: *

'I ask the House whether, during the four nights in this great arena of reason and discussion, any argument has been made by any English, Scotch, or Irish representative to show that fixity of tenure, to be applied as a means of securing justice and peace in Ireland, can for a moment abide its trial at the bar of reason. I wish to record the great

* See 'Hansard's Debates,' vol. excix. p. 1842. In the same place will be found an admirable speech by Sir Roundell Palmer, in which the same arguments we are now using were most ably and emphatically expressed.

fact that fixity of tenure has remained during four long nights' debate on the second reading of a Bill on land tenure in Ireland wholly unsustained by the slightest attempt at reasoning. Perpetuity of tenure is a phrase that I flatter myself is a little going out of fashion. If I have contributed anything towards disparaging it, I am not sorry.'

If by 'fixity of tenure' is meant the possibility of fixing every poor tenant in Ireland to the plot of ground which affords him a precarious and inadequate subsistence, without the means of removing him from it by emigration or otherwise, we can only say that such a measure would be the greatest conceivable curse to the population and the soil of Ireland, since the only effectual means of improving their condition is to clear the land of tenants who are too poor to cultivate it and too numerous to live upon it. 'Fixity of tenure' is only another term for a perpetuity of misery and improvidence.

Again, it is a doctrine of the Land League, reduced to practice in Ireland, that eviction is a crime to be resisted by force and punished by death. But eviction is the practical sanction of every contract of hire or service. It simply means, that when a person fails to perform his part in a contract, he is dismissed from it, and deprived of any advantage he may derive from it. Would any of these gentlemen hesitate to evict a servant who broke the china or cooked a bad dinner? Is not every clerk, every shopman, every labourer liable to be evicted from his place for non-performance of duty? Are not hundreds of tenants in our large cities continually evicted from the lodgings they occupy at a weekly rent, if they fail to pay it? Did not the constituencies of the kingdom evict Mr. Gladstone from office in 1874, and Lord Beaconsfield in 1879? Does not the rule and the practice pervade all the relations of society? Is it in Ireland alone that a tenant is to claim fixity of tenure and exemption from eviction, when he fails or refuses to perform the conditions on which alone he was enabled to enter into possession of his farm? Such a pretension 'cannot for a moment abide its trial' at the bar of reason,' or, we will add, of justice.

But this is not all. To attain a result which we conceive to be bad in itself, the means suggested are still more obnoxious to criticism, for this independence of the small proprietors is to be brought about, not by the natural and proper effect of his own industry, but by the intervention of the State. On the old and established ground of public economy, the intervention of the State in private transactions, in liberty of contract, in buying and selling, or in regulating prices, is always to be deprecated.

We are here at once brought into direct opposition with Socialism, for the first doctrine of Socialism is that property and labour, and the contracts affecting them, should be regulated by the State and not by the free operation of natural causes. Nor is the evil lessened when this intervention of the State is dictated and directed by philanthropic motives. There is just as much jobbery, trickery, and oppression in those large operations as in the small dealings of man and man; and they have, moreover, the pernicious effect of disturbing all the conditions of the private market.

It has been suggested that a sum of money, necessarily large, should be granted by the British Parliament for the purpose of buying estates of Irish landlords and parcelling them out amongst peasant proprietors. To Irish landlords fortunate enough to sell their property on fair terms such a measure would bring welcome relief. But in any other point of view it would, in our judgment, be wholly mischievous. Nothing can be more foolish and detestable than the doctrine that large concessions, pecuniary or political, are to be wrung from the British Parliament by Irish agitation and crime. If it be once admitted that agitation and crime will have the effect of opening the British Treasury to Irish demands on it, agitation and crime will assuredly never cease. Such a weak and short-sighted policy offers a direct premium to rebellion: we should simply out of cowardice be paying black-mail to Ireland, and endeavouring to buy off the enemy thundering at our gates. The same men who are clamorous for assistance from the British Parliament are the promoters of a repeal of the Union. Is the British Parliament to make a large investment of the money of the British taxpayer in the land of a country which is seeking to detach itself from Great Britain? As far as the removal of Irish distress and disaffection lies, the money had better be cast into the sea than spent in the purchase of Irish estates, for England would then become, for the next half-century, the huge landlord of Ireland, bound to exact from the tenant not only rent, but the dues of redemption, and to evict all those who failed to pay them. England would be said to draw tribute from Ireland, and the whole storm of animosity now directed against Irish landlords would be turned, with more apparent reason, against the collectors of the revenue. We cannot conceive that a scheme of so absurd a character will ever assume a substantial form or would ever receive the sanction of Parliament. A close dissection of it would cut such quackery of legislation to atoms. On strict economical principles even the authors of these

proposals know that they are utterly indefensible; but the truth is, they are not put forward on economical grounds at all; they are merely used for the purpose of political agitation.

But although we entertain an absolute distrust of these schemes, which we hold to be not only unjust but injurious, there are doubtless some measures which the present state of Ireland demands. The first duty is to acquire more accurate information as to the real state of the country. This has been provided for by the appointment of the Royal Agricultural Commission, and, whatever may be the report of that body, it is of great importance that the evidence taken should be made public as soon as possible. The next steps we should prescribe, though not strictly consistent with economical principles and freedom of contract, are, we think, admissible in the present state of Ireland. The Government should proceed to order a revaluation of the lands of Ireland, showing as far as possible the nature of the property and tenancy, the relative interest of those to whom it belongs, and the real value of the land on a fair estimate. Such an operation, though difficult, would not be more so than the territorial settlements of whole provinces in India, which are executed with minute accuracy. Griffiths' valuation is not only imperfect but deceptive, as is abundantly shown in the pamphlets before us. It was made for the purposes of taxation, not of renting. You might as well take the value at which the houses in London are assessed to the parochial rates and declare that this, and no more, shall be the rent payable by a tenant in Mayfair. The result of such an inquiry would be, as we believe, to show that lands in Ireland are held at much lower rent than lands in Britain; and that the large estates, especially those of English proprietors and corporations, are held on easier and more liberal terms than those of small Irish landowners, and are in a better condition. A valuation of the land ought to take into account as far as possible the amount of capital and even labour which the tenant has invested in improving it; and to this extent he should be protected by the law, and entitled to compensation on quitting it.

The second measure which commends itself to our judgment is one which was suggested by Mr. Nassau Senior more than twenty years ago, during one of his visits to Ireland. He says:—

‘Mr. L. P. dined with us (at Birr Castle). I suggested to him the plan which had been proposed to me, of creating a tribunal which on the eviction of a tenant from any cause, except breach of covenant or non-payment of rent, should be empowered to judge what (if any)

compensation should be paid to him. The idea was new to him.' (Senior's 'Ireland,' ii. 239.)

This proposal (made in 1858) has to some extent been realised by the Land Act of 1870. But the power of the courts might go further. As in India, increase of rent might be the subject of an enhancement suit, and disputed cases might be settled by a summary reference to the magistrate. In fact, if Government is to interfere at all, the territorial administration of India, where the rights of zemindars and ryots are defined and protected by the magistracy, is as good a model as could be followed; but nothing can be more unlike that freedom of contract which has heretofore been of the essence of English life. The Radical party are, in fact, unconsciously advocating the measures of a despotic system of government. We think, however, that such a land court might with advantage be established in each of the four provinces of Ireland; and that all contracts whatsoever between landlord and tenant for the occupation or letting of land should be *registered* for their mutual protection, and should so be brought under the jurisdiction of the Land Court if any dispute arose as to the fulfilment of the contract by either party. No unregistered contract to have any force or validity. Simple forms of contract might easily be drawn up and provided at the public expense.

The Land League addresses itself to the well-known passion of the Irish peasant for a corner of the soil on which he may raise a hovel, marry, breed, plant potatoes, and sometimes starve. That passion he will gratify, or seek to gratify, at any cost of mendacity and crime. But the leaders of the movement have in view another object. They are putting forward claims which they know the British Parliament will never grant. They are exciting passions by which they hope to intimidate the Ministers of the Crown. But the inference they draw from their own abortive agitation is, that Ireland will never enjoy an unbounded license of confiscation and confusion until she recovers her national parliament and government on College Green. It is not the distress or the land-hunger of the Irish peasantry with which alone we have to deal. It is the old political question of Ireland, the aspirations of an enthusiastic nationality, and the undying hatred of the Church of Rome and of a Catholic people to a Protestant State. The land question is but the mask of these passions. Grant it all, grant more, and when the last grievance is swept away, and the last landlord exterminated, you will find yourselves in presence of a political rebellion in the pro-

tean form of secret societies and social anarchy. The present disturbance of Ireland is the result of a political scheme far more subtle and adroit than the Repeal movement of O'Connell or the Fenian conspiracy. But the object and the results are and will be the same.

The work entitled 'Young Ireland,' which we have placed at the head of this article, reminds us, if that were necessary, of the striking similarity existing between the present state of Ireland and that through which the country passed between 1840 and 1850. Sir Charles Gavan Duffy belonged to a generation now passing away, but not without successors. Some of them perished miserably enough; others, like Sir Charles himself, became Colonial Ministers and Knights of St. Michael and St. George. One of them, we observe, is the accomplished nobleman who now holds the great seal of Ireland with a peerage; and we were not prepared to meet the highly respected member for Finsbury in such company, even before he inverted his names. These, it seems, were the founders, heroes, and martyrs of the 'Nation,' and we are free to confess that the Young Ireland of those days had incomparably more patriotism, eloquence, and energy than their degenerate successors. But even Ireland cannot produce an inexhaustible supply of Davises and Duffys. It is in the nature of all human things—

‘In pejus ruere et retro sublapsa referri;’

and at each succeeding stage the tone and attitude of these agitators have become more vulgar, ignorant, unscrupulous, and contemptible, but not on that account less formidable. Their object is the repeal of the Union, or, in other words, to establish their own power over Ireland, uncontrolled by England; and so, by working on the passions and wants of the lowest orders of the peasantry, to terrorise, crush, or exterminate the vast majority of the intelligence of the nation. Revolutions are commonly made by minorities. But as long as Ireland forms a part of the United Kingdom and is governed by English Ministers and garrisoned by an English army, no complete revolution is possible. The first step is to disarm authority, and to that object Mr. Parnell's exertions have been directed. The Parliamentary obstruction, of which he is the inventor, and which has done so much to embarrass and degrade the House of Commons, is only a part of the same scheme. His object is merely to render the Irish element in the British Parliament intolerable.

But he has also summoned to his aid another element, which

played a far smaller part in the days of John Mitchel and Smith O'Brien. This is not only a conspiracy against the State, but it is a *foreign* conspiracy. Mr. Parnell, being himself, we believe, partly of American descent, has sought to plant his leverage beyond the reach of the Castle police, and indeed across the Atlantic. During the distress of last year, he made a progress through the United States to kindle the hatred of the Hiberno-Americans against England, to raise money, and to purchase arms. His exertions were not unproductive, although the more respectable journals of the United States denounced him as using the language of ingratitude, calumny, and treason. It is needless to say that these Irish agitators in America have never received the slightest encouragement from the Government of the United States. The Republican party in America are bitterly hostile to the Irish element in that country, and the whole Irish vote was 'cast solid,' as they term it, in favour of the Democratic candidate, who was defeated by General Garfield. One of the most powerful organs of the agitation is the 'Irish World,' a newspaper printed in America, and imported regularly into Ireland, where it circulates largely amongst the peasantry, although it is not easy to obtain even a copy of it for the uninitiated. The language of this paper is purely revolutionary. We believe that it is written by some of the Fenian felons who have completed their term of punishment or have been let loose from the gaols of England.

Mr. Bagenal informs us :—

'The names are worth noticing. John Devoy, as we have already mentioned, was one of the most active members of the Fenian Brotherhood, and entered the British army for the purpose of seducing the soldiers from their allegiance. Since Mr. Parnell has been in America he has been in close connexion and correspondence with Devoy. Thomas F. Bourke is a convicted and attainted traitor: convicted and attainted of high treason, for attempting to dethrone the Queen, and to raise an Irish Republic on the ruins of the monarchy. He headed the Fenian outbreak in Tipperary, on March 5, 1867; appeared in the field at the old Danish fort of Ballyhurst, mounted (for he is lame), distributing a cartload of pikes and muskets among the crowd, who fired on some soldiers of the 31st Regiment; then instantly fled, leaving their lame leader to his fate. For this horrible crime he was tried at Dublin on April 27, 1867, convicted, and sentenced to be hanged, beheaded, drawn, and quartered, but his life was spared, and he was only lately released from perpetual penal servitude. Thomas Clarke Luby is well known as having been editor of the "Irish People," and was convicted in 1865, was found guilty of treason felony, and condemned to penal servitude for a period of twenty years.

'These are the men with whom Michael Davitt is in daily communication by letter or cable, and such are the chosen friends of Mr. Parnell in America.

'The foundation of the "Irish World" probably dates from the liberation of some of the Fenian prisoners. At all events it professes to have founded the anti-rent agitation, and takes credit to itself for having commenced "the great Land war, the most resplendent of its "triumphs," boasts this print, "especially the 'Irish World's' victory." For eight years it declares that it has laboured incessantly to bring on the anti-Land-law agitation. In what light that Land agitation is looked upon may be gathered from the following passage from the issue of August 30, 1879:—

"THE GOOD WORK."

"So far as the scope of our observation extends, there has never yet been a time in the history of Irish revolutionary organisations when the men consecrated to the liberation of their motherland were more zealous in the cause, more harmonious in council, more intelligently active, less solicitous for 'leadership,' or more animated by a profound sense of duty in the prosecution to a final and successful issue of the holy work—is it not a holy work?—which they have now in hand.

"And for this most satisfactory state of things three names—John Devoy, John J. Breslin, and Dr. Carroll—deserve especial thanks.

"Ireland has other good and excellent sons working faithfully in her cause; but these three men—Carroll, Breslin, and Devoy—impress us as men that have made a covenant, each with himself, to sink all other considerations, and to render every purpose entirely subservient to this one aspiration of their existence.

"Never did we feel more confident than now of the ultimate success of Ireland's standard.

"And what we rest our solid hope upon is the fact that a *good beginning* has been made.

"'First know you're right,' was the sensible advice of Sam Slick, 'then go ahead!'

"THE IRISH REVOLUTION AT LAST LOOKS IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION.

"Fenianism saw only a Green Flag—a very good thing in its place, but not the *only* thing needed by the Irish people.

"THE MEN OF TO-DAY HAVE DISCOVERED THERE IS SUCH A THING AS LAND, AND THAT EVERY MAN BORN INTO THE WORLD WITHIN THE SEA-GIRT MARGIN OF IRELAND HAS AN *inalienable right* TO A MAN'S SHARE OF THAT LAND.

"First *Light*, then *Action*. This is the programme of our day."

'Messrs. Devoy, Breslin, and Carroll were the men who welcomed Mr. Parnell on his arrival in America, and he has been in constant communication with them ever since.'

Stripped of all disguise, the plain truth is, that these men are all aiming, and have ever aimed, at the severance of Ire-

land from the legislative and executive control of Great Britain; and that no concessions, no grants, no changes in the law, no measures of conciliation, no acts of liberality, or generosity or kindness, will turn them from that purpose. They say so themselves. They speak in this respect truly. Sir Charles Gavan Duffy's book, which he has thought it convenient to publish at the present time, shows that 'e'en in 'his ashes live their wonted fires!' He has played a useful part in one of the colonies as a Minister of the Crown, and he has received a mark of distinction from his Sovereign. He is not, therefore, a very convincing example of the exclusiveness and ingratitude of England to her Irish fellow-subjects. But the spirit of 'Young Ireland' is still strong in him. He laughs at the delusion of Federalism, and the meaning of his book, as far as we can discover it, is Total Repeal. The quarrel of 'Young Ireland' with O'Connell arose from the belief that he was too wary and pacific a leader. Under a multitude of forms, it is one and the same spirit which breathes through the whole course of Irish politics for a hundred years. In the eyes of the National party, England is to Ireland what Austria was to the Milanese, or Russia is to Poland. It is no use to argue that the bulk of the Irish people are of our own blood and language, and that the excesses of their own agitation and the impunity of their crimes demonstrate that they certainly enjoy a greater degree of freedom than any nation in Europe, except ourselves, and not less than ourselves. In fact no argument on the subject is of any avail at all. It is an affair of national feeling, worked upon by the Celtic and Catholic party, who view Great Britain with irreconcilable hostility.*

Nothing can be more plain and explicit than the language of Mr. Parnell.

'The feudal tenure,' said that gentleman at Cincinnati, 'and the rule of the minority have been the corner-stone of English Misrule.'

* The Fenian oath was in the following terms in 1858 :—'I. A. B. 'do solemnly swear and declare, in the presence of Almighty God, that 'I renounce all allegiance to the Queen of England, that I will do all in 'my power to make Ireland an independent democratic Republic, that 'I will implicitly obey all the orders of my superiors in this Society, 'and that I will take up arms at the first summons and at a moment's 'notice, so help me God!' (See Mr. Senior's 'Ireland,' vol. ii. p. 86.) The explanation of the astonishing power over the peasantry exercised by the leagues and secret societies with which Ireland is perforated, is that oaths of this nature and of secrecy are imposed on the people and rigorously observed by them, under a religious sanction.

Pull out the corner-stone, break it up, destroy it, and you undermine English Misgovernment. When we have undermined English Misgovernment we have paved the way for Ireland to take her place among the nations of the earth. *And let us not forget that that is the ultimate goal at which all we Irishmen aim.* None of us—whether in America or in Ireland, or wherever we may be—will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England.’ And the language of Mr. Parnell has been the same in Ireland as it was in America. ‘I would not have taken off my coat and gone to this work,’ he said at Galway when speaking of the objects of the Land League, ‘if I had not known that we were laying the foundation in this movement for the regeneration of our legislative independence.’ ‘We ask you,’ he said when speaking of the present Administration to the men of Roscommon and Westmeath, ‘while this weak, vacillating, and cowardly Government are inquiring into this question and making up their mind, to show that you have inherited some of the determination of your fathers, and that you are determined to hold by your homesteads until you have undone the conquest of seven hundred years ago.’

At Waterford, on the 6th December last, Mr. Parnell held the same language, and we will do him the justice to say there is no ambiguity about it. It is a declaration of war against this country.

‘We stand to-day in the same position as our ancestors. We declare that it is the duty of every Irishman to free his country if he can. We refuse to inflict needless suffering on the masses of our people. We will work by constitutional means so long as it suits us to do so. We refuse to plunge this country into the horrors of civil war when she has not a chance; but I ask any man at this board, I ask any true Irishman, be he priest or be he layman, whether he would not consider it the first duty of an Irishman to do what he could to enable his country to take her place among the nations of the world. If it could be shown to them that there was a fair prospect of success from the sacrifice, I ask my reverend and my lay friends whether they would not consider it their highest duty to give their lives for the country that gave them birth. I call for no vain, no useless sacrifice. I do not wish to be misunderstood for a moment. Our present path is within the lines of the Constitution. England has given us that Constitution for her purposes; we will use it for ours; and if I ever call, or if anybody over whom I have any influence ever calls, upon the people of Ireland to go beyond the line of that Constitution, we shall do so openly and aboveboard, not by any subterfuge. We shall not ask any people to share a risk that we are unwilling to encounter ourselves.’

We believe such language to be foolish and unjust: but that is not the question. It has sunk deep into the hearts of the people of Ireland, and it has again created in that country the most formidable social organisation for the purposes of

rebellion which has existed since the dissolution of the Catholic Association in 1829. That danger was averted, when the Duke of Wellington saw that the alternative was civil war, by a concession to what was firmly believed to be the cause of justice and sound policy as well as of religious toleration. But in the present crisis to concede the demands of the Land League would be to destroy the basis of society and plunge the country into endless calamities. The Land League has acquired by terrorism an authority over the population, willing or unwilling, which supersedes the authority of the law. All crimes are unpunished. All rights are unprotected. It is, as was said of the Catholic Association, an institution inimical to the public peace; and the first condition of the restoration of law and order appears to be that this body, which is merely a revolutionary tribunal in disguise, should be declared to be illegal, and dissolved. But be that as it may, the spirit of disaffection to this country will survive.

We are tempted, then, to consider what would be the consequences to the two countries if this purely Irish national policy prevailed and were carried out. It might, we think, be argued with some plausibility that the direct and positive advantages derived by Great Britain from the union with Ireland are extremely small, and not equal to the disadvantages attending it, although no doubt the evils of a repeal of the union might be still greater. The revenue raised from the Irish people is not more than her share in the expenses of government, and at least half of it consists in the duty levied on spirits! * Our military establishment is heavily weighted by duty in Ireland. We contribute to Irish local expenses more than half what the Imperial Treasury contributes to the local expenses of all Great Britain. Ireland is more lightly taxed than Britain; in short, on mere financial grounds the case is scarcely worth arguing.

Does the union with Ireland increase the strength of Great Britain? We are afraid it does not; it may rather be a source of weakness. There seems to us but little force in the argument that if England dissolved her connexion with Ireland, that island would fall into the hands of a foreign Power. We do not conceive that either France or the United States

* It was shown by Dr. Hancock in 1864 that the expenditure fairly chargeable to Ireland in 1861 was greater than the contribution of Ireland to the expenses of the Empire by 1,002,938*l.*, according to one calculation, or at least 691,355*l.* by another. See an article on Irish Federation in the '*Edinburgh Review*,' vol. cxxxiii. p. 527.

entertain the smallest desire of adding Ireland to their possessions, or would on any terms accept so damaging a gift, and it is obvious that no power not permanently superior to England at sea could hold it. The truth is, that Ireland in its present condition is a greater cause of weakness to Britain in her foreign relations than if she were independent. There it is that we are most vulnerable, and in the event of war with a great military and maritime nation, the defence of Ireland would weigh heavily on our British resources, especially as the enemies of this country would find abundant encouragement from the leaders of a disaffected people.

It need hardly be said that in the present overburdened state of the British Parliament it would be an enormous gain to be relieved from the ever-recurring discussion of Irish grievances and the obstructive ingenuity of Irish representatives. It is not a pleasant reflection that the House of Commons as now constituted contains a certain number of persons who are the declared enemies of the institutions of this country, and who come here to do as much mischief as they can, or rather to utter as much treason as they dare, for by treason we mean avowed hostility to the fundamental conditions of the State.

We also view with great repugnance the growing influence of what is termed the Irish vote in British elections. There are, as is well known, many boroughs in the north of England, and some few, perhaps, in Scotland, where the balance of parties may be turned by the injection of the Irish voters, and those voters are notoriously governed and guided by an organisation altogether alien to British interests or British parties. They are essentially a foreign element, for their objects, or the objects of those who direct their movements with absolute authority, are not only not the national objects of the British people of England and Scotland, but are directly opposed to them. We are confronted, from the great liberty and latitude of our own institutions, by an element in our Parliament and in our constituencies not only heterogeneous, but hostile to ourselves, and using the power we have conferred upon it against ourselves. In times of great peril or pressure such a power, lodged like a canker in the very heart of authority, might prove disastrous.

But let us consider the other side of the picture. We dismiss at once the phantom of federalism or a partial and nominal union with Ireland. Either that island must have complete self-government or it must not. The responsibility of government cannot be divided. Nor would it be admissible that the Irish should combine all the privileges of British

subjects in England with the privileges of Irish independence at home. The Colonies have a large extent of self-government, but the Colonies send no representatives to the House of Commons. The Irish can scarcely wish to place themselves on the level of a colonial dependency of the Crown. Before the Union an Irish peer could sit in the House of Peers at Dublin and in the House of Commons at Westminster; that double species of existence could not be prolonged. Ireland for the Irish means that in England the Irish would be what the citizens of the United States now are, aliens. They would exercise no civil rights, except in Ireland. They would be entitled to the protection of the Irish, not of the British, Government. Their resources, means of subsistence, and employments would be restricted to their own island, or at least would not extend to Britain. We have offered the Irish, as has been before remarked, and with no stinted liberality, an equal share in all the rights, possessions, and advantages of subjects of Queen Victoria and citizens of this Empire. A certain party in Ireland, the Repeal party, repudiate allegiance to Queen Victoria and the citizenship of the British Empire. They wish to be Irish citizens and Irish citizens only. To us the loss would not be great, but have they calculated what it would cost themselves? For of this at least we are certain, that men cannot remain members of the British Empire who are seeking to destroy it, and are animated by fierce hatred of it. Suppose the gods in anger granted their prayer. Suppose that as Great Britain, when she learned that the Corfiotes and Cephaloniotes denounced and detested the protectorate of this country, forthwith resolved to leave them to their fate, and consigned them to at least temporary ruin—a just punishment for disaffection and ingratitude—suppose it were possible to inflict on Ireland a like benefit or a like chastisement. What would be the result? The population of the greater part of the island would return a Catholic and Celtic parliament, the North a Presbyterian and Orange minority. Such a parliament would be the counterpart of that of James II. in 1692, when indeed this very experiment may be said to have been tried under a sovereign who was at least legitimate. Their first act (if they were consistent) would be to repeal the Act of Settlement, which has been in force for two centuries. They would probably restore as far as possible the property of the Roman Catholic Church. A very large portion of the classes possessing property and education in the country would fly as from a social revolution. Commerce, navigation, and the intercourse of social life would be suspended. Large

numbers of men would be thrown out of employment, and would have no resources to fall back upon. The Irish would cease to derive a large income from work done in this country : those already here ought to return home. The revenue that could be raised would be very small ; if the duty on spirits was reduced it would be nothing. In fact, society itself would for a time be resolved into vigilance committees and armed bodies of hostile sects and parties. The police being abolished and the army withdrawn, the people of Ireland would be left to gratify their instincts at the expense of their neighbours ; and neither party in Ireland is so much changed that we might not witness a repetition of the horrors of 1641 or 1798. Civil war would soon be organised on a more regular footing, and, if we are not much mistaken, the energy and valour of the North, backed as it must be by the strong sympathy of the people of this country, would, as of old, triumph over their enemies ; but at what a cost !

This is the grand, the paramount, the conclusive reason which compels us to reject and relinquish for ever the idea of severing the connexion between these two islands. It is not merely on account of the interests or the welfare of England ; they are not at stake in the question. It is the consequences to Ireland herself if the hand of England were not stretched forth to moderate the animosity of her furious parties, to relieve at times her dire necessities, to give employment and a home to the thousands who wisely leave her shores, and to endeavour to improve her internal condition by just administration and liberal measures. So little progress have the Irish made in the true lessons of political science and in the experience of self-government, that the very things for which they clamour loudest are those which would prove most fatal to their peace. It is characteristic of such a state of things that the doctrines of Socialism should have been propagated with success amongst such a people, and should have brought the country to the verge of a Jacquerie or Peasant War. And this tendency is fanned and flattered by orators and newspaper writers who all work on the same vein. No other form of literature or argument reaches the country.

Therefore we hold that Great Britain has no alternative but to persevere in the firm resolution to govern Ireland to the best of her ability and in the light of her own convictions of policy and justice. The time is long past when a British Parliament could be in any degree influenced by jealousy, hostility, or intolerance to Ireland. On the contrary, the danger is lest we should sacrifice some of our own convictions and

principles in the hope of conciliating or converting our opponents. From that weakness we trust that the present Government of the United Kingdom will remain free. They have shown, as Lord John Russell and his colleagues showed in 1847 and 1848, at the time of the Fenian conspiracy, an extreme reluctance to suspend the ordinary course of law; but, as was the case at that time, they are driven on by the stern force of necessity. The very first measure of the present Session is a complete acknowledgment of this truth. The law does not exist to protect criminals and to leave life and property at the mercy of gangs of conspirators and assassins. We do not conceal our regret that measures were not taken at a much earlier period, as they might have been, for the prevention and punishment of crimes which are a disgrace to the United Kingdom. The highest authorities have repeatedly declared that the protection of life and property is the first duty of Government. But he who may hereafter read the history of Ireland during the present winter will be inclined to ask how this duty has been fulfilled.

The foregoing pages have been written solely with the desire to point out the disastrous consequences that must ensue from any departure from the sound principles of political economy and jurisprudence which can never be violated with impunity, and the ulterior political effects of this agitation upon the common interests of the United Kingdom. We have studiously refrained from any attempt to arraign or to defend the action of any political party or any ministerial combination in this great crisis, although we view with pain and amazement the course of events, by which more than one political reputation may be blasted, and the authority of the State itself shaken. But the state of affairs appears to us to be far too serious to be made the subject of party altercation and personal criticism. Parliament has met, and within its walls Ministers will doubtless explain the principles which have governed their policy. We trust, and we believe, that the patriotism of the House of Commons will lead that great assembly to receive the proposals of the Government, whether they be of a coercive or a remedial character, with an earnest desire to rescue Ireland from imminent danger and Great Britain from reproach; for there has seldom been a time when it is more important to give an effective and unanimous support to the measures of the Executive Government and the authority of the Crown.

CONTENTS OF No. 314.

	Page
ART. I.—The Life of the Right Reverend Samuel Wilberforce, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford and afterwards of Winchester. By A. R. Ashwell, M.A. Vol. I. London : 1880,	305
II.—1. Papers respecting the Affairs of Egypt, presented to Parliament by Command of Her Majesty. 1876–1880.	
2. Commission Supérieure d'Enquête. Rapport préliminaire adressé à S.-A. le Khédive. Alexandrie : 1878.	
3. Ismaïl Pasha Saddyk, ou la Mort du Moutfettich. Caire : 1879.	
4. First Report of the Commissioners of the Egyptian State Domains. Cairo : 1880,	336
III.—The Song of Roland Translated into English Verse. By John O'Hagan, M.A. London : 1880,	370
IV.—1. Memoir of the Public Life of the Right Hon. John Charles Herries in the Reigns of George III., George IV., William IV., and Victoria. By his Son, Edward Herries, C.B. With an Introduction by Sir Charles Herries, K.C.B. London : 1880.	
2. A Political Diary, 1828–1830. By Edward Law, Lord Ellenborough. Edited by Lord Colchester. London : 1881,	390
V.—1. Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Conservancy Boards, &c. Session 1877.	
2. Report from the Select Committee (of the House of Commons) on Thames Floods Prevention. 1877.	
3. Report from the Select Committee on Thames River (Prevention of Floods) Bill. 1877.	
4. Water and Water Supply, chiefly in reference to the British Islands. By Professor O. T. Ansted. London : 1878.	
5. Rain : How, when, where, why, it is measured. By G. J. Symons. London : 1867,	417

	Page
VI.—La Pellagra in Italia. <i>Annali di Agricoltura</i> . Published by the Minister of Agriculture and Commerce. Rome: 1880,	448
VII.—Reminiscences of Thomas Carlyle. Edited by James Anthony Froude. Two vols. London: 1881,	469
VIII.—1. The Power of Movement in Plants. By Charles Darwin, LL.D., F.R.S.; assisted by Francis Darwin. London: 1880.	
2. A Text-Book of Physiology. By M. Foster, M.A., M.D., F.R.S., Prælector in Physiology and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Third Edition, revised. London: 1879,	497
IX.—Ilios: the City and Country of the Trojans. The Results of Researches and Discoveries on the Site of Troy and throughout the Troad in the years 1871-73, 78-79. By Dr. Henry Schliemann. London: 1880,	514
X.—1. Return of Loans advanced for Relief of Trade to March, 1874. Parliamentary Paper, 145. 1875.	
2. Report of the Select Committee on the Public Works Loan Acts Amendment, and Consolidation Bills, together with the Evidence. 1875.	
3. The First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Annual Report of the Public Works Loan Board. 1876-1880.	
4. Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Reports of the Local Government Board. 1876-1878-1879,	548

THE EDINBURGH REVIEW,

APRIL, 1881.

No. CCCXIV.

ART. I.—*The Life of the Right Reverend Samuel Wilberforce, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford and afterwards of Winchester.*
Vol. I. London: 1880.

THERE is a general impression prevailing in this generation that the religious movement of the nineteenth century began with the Oxford school about the year 1834. This impression appears in widely different circles—in Mr. Gladstone's autobiography, in Mr. McCarthy's 'History of Our Own Times,' in Mr. Stephens' 'Life of Dean Hook,' and still more in the general tone of the younger speakers and writers of this time, from some of whom it would almost appear as if they believed that Christianity had hardly existed in England between the Reformation and the beginning of the 'Tracts for the Times.' It may be necessary in the first instance to take a larger view of the subject, and to ask, What is the real nature of what is called the revival of religion in this century? The assumption in question to which we referred rests in large measure on the depreciation of the religious character of the eighteenth century. We have now, almost for the first time, some means of judging of that despised age more accurately. The 'History of Religious Thought' by Mr. Hunt, the 'History of England in the Eighteenth Century' by Mr. Lecky, who has devoted some of his most important chapters to its religious aspect, the two volumes of Mr. Abbey and Mr. Overton on the side of the Church, and that of Dr. Stoughton on the side of the Nonconformists, give us, if not a complete, yet a sufficient insight into the theological and spiritual life of those times.

There was a main stream of religious thought which we may call characteristic of the century, but diverging on the

right hand and on the left into the two separate channels of the enthusiasm of the non-jurors on the one side, and of Wesley and his followers on the other. If on the hierarchical side it may be said that the sect of non-jurors was too thin and too narrow to be taken as the representative of any large amount of ecclesiastical ardour, yet the career of Wesley, extending from first to last over almost the whole century, is enough to redeem it from the charge of general irreligious temper so often brought against it. That could not have been an entirely godless age which witnessed and fostered the most apostolic energy that the Church of England, either before or after the Reformation, has ever produced.

Still it is true that the main tendency of the eighteenth century was in another direction. Its characteristic quality was what under its better aspect is called sobriety, and under its worse aspect stagnation. What appears to us torpor, even in the highest and best characters of the time—as, for example, Butler and Secker—would, by a natural contagion, become deeper and darker in the outlying districts of the country. Nonconformity and churchmanship were alike infected by it.

Nevertheless it must be remarked that on the whole there was through the eighteenth century an advance, and not a retrogression from the age which had preceded it. The period of the Revolution, including a preacher so persuasive to his contemporaries as Tillotson, Bishop Burnet, almost the first in our Church to set the example of pastoral activity, and a layman so highly honoured both for good words and good deeds as Robert Nelson, marks a clear improvement on the reign of Charles II. And the excellent appointments to the episcopal bench made under the influence of Queen Caroline, the consort of George II., perhaps the best that have ever been made for a long continuance in the Church of England, secured, at least in high places, a long succession of unusual light and heat. If, during the close of the reign of George II. and the beginning of the reign of George III., a relapse may be observed in the character of the Episcopate, and consequently in the character of the clergy, it is no more than must of necessity happen in the flux and reflux of intellectual and moral activity in successive generations of the world, and of the peculiar depression of which we have so lively a picture in Mr. Trevelyan's 'Early History of Charles James Fox.'

The religion inaugurated by characters such as those just mentioned, if deficient in the zeal of later days, certainly abounded in the pre-eminently Christian virtues of moderation, liberality, and justice, which the eighteenth century

may fairly claim as in a special sense its own peculiar glory. Hoadly, Berkeley, and Butler cannot be regarded as types of episcopal virtue according to our altered conception of the office, but they were highly honoured in their own time, and may be highly honoured still in ours, as examples of graces for the lack of which many a Christian Church has pined and withered away. The sturdy, vehement, wide-embracing religion of Samuel Johnson was eminently characteristic of his age. And, further, it may be observed that these latitudinarian qualities form not the least attractive part of the characters of those leaders of thought and action who belong to one or other of the two diverging schools already mentioned. Wesley has maintained, and will maintain, his place, not so much by his peculiar doctrines of assurance and instantaneous conversion, as by what he himself called his 'catholic spirit,' and by his firm hold on the moral, as distinct from the ceremonial and dogmatical, side of Christianity. It was the moral fervour which Fletcher of Madeley possessed in common with Wesley that recommended him to no less keen an observer than Voltaire, as the nearest likeness to Jesus Christ which that age produced. Cowper in his poems recommended himself to a certain section, no doubt, chiefly by the theology of his friend John Newton; yet the graces which won for him the love of all English Christendom were the more general virtues of gentleness and devotion which he shared with the best of his contemporaries. Even in the small non-juring communion Law had quite as much of the latitudinarian as of the high churchman. Whilst his spiritual ardour won the affection of Wesley, his views on the Atonement and on Revelation were such as would be held by the most advanced theologians of his own time, or, we may add, of ours.*

Such was the religious soil on which the new atmosphere of the nineteenth century discharged its peculiar element of feeling and of speculation. What was that peculiar element? It was

* We are indebted to Mr. Overton for a Life of 'William Law, 'Nonjuror and Mystic,' recently published, which supplies a missing link in English ecclesiastical biography, and is of considerable interest, though we are surprised that Mr. Overton should have devoted himself to so ungrateful a task. For the one important fact in the life of Law was the publication of his 'Serious Call,' a work which seems to us to have been amazingly over-estimated by his contemporaries, and even by such men as Dr. Johnson and Mr. Burke. But in fact Law was by his Jacobite and enthusiastic opinions a man *outside* the Church of England, and his influence on the religious thought of the country was mainly translated through Wesley.

the deeper seriousness breathed into the minds of men, not only in England but in Europe, by the great convulsion of the French Revolution. In Germany there was the manifestation of such men as Görres on the Roman side, and of Schleiermacher on the Protestant side. In France it appeared in Madame de Staël and Chateaubriand, as well as in the historical and philosophical researches of the school of Guizot and of Cousin. In England it revealed itself in the enterprise of the Abolitionists, and in Wilberforce's 'Practical Christianity.' In Scotland it was manifested by three writers, if of unequal fame, yet all in their several ways representing the enlarged relations of the human mind to literature and to religion—Walter Scott first and foremost, and following upon him the most eloquent preacher of that time, Edward Irving, and the sombre genius of Thomas Carlyle.

This deeper earnestness was further marked not only in the instances just quoted, but also in the natural succession which has, even to this day, handed on the torch which they kindled; and by the growing interest in history and poetry which the eighteenth century, if it had not lost it altogether (for in history we cannot forget Robertson and Gibbon, nor in poetry Pope, with all his faults), failed to connect with the main progress of religion. Coleridge stands at the head of those who united in one the theology and the philosophy of his time; Wordsworth, more vaguely, yet not less profoundly, combined the religious sentiment with the worship of nature.

These converging streams of spiritual life had already begun to produce a steady increase of all the more practical elements of religious activity in the early years of the century. The first Oriel school, as it was called, of which we may be allowed perhaps to take Arnold as the chief representative, the admirable combination of piety and literature in Reginald Heber, the acute and powerful mind of Whately, the devouring industry and wide liberality of Milman, belong to this stage of the English revival; and it is not too much to say that amidst the noise of more clamorous partisans the pastoral energy and the intellectual research stimulated by these and like examples still continue the chief light which, not less efficiently because quietly, and for the simple sake of doing good, illuminates the course of many a worker in country parish and in crowded city. The clergy that appear in the novels of Lord Beaconsfield and of George Eliot are striking examples of the unaffected piety and good sense which were supposed to adorn the pastoral ministrations of this period. The characters of the Bishop in 'Venetia,' and of Irwine

in 'Adam Bede,' challenge comparison with any of the excited controversialists of our own day.

It was in the midst of the steady onward flow of this large revival that it was interrupted, or, if we choose to say, coloured, by the rise of the Oxford school in 1834. Even those who claim for this school most emphatically the exclusive honour of restoring the religious life of England would perhaps, on reflection, grant some share in its credit to the 'Evangelical party,' who, chiefly in the University of Cambridge, had already produced a visible effect in stirring the hearts of the younger students, and in throwing something of their own cherished dogmatic phraseology over the spirit of the age. Cardinal Newman (in naming that name, we may be allowed, as Englishmen, to hail the honour conferred on an illustrious master of the English language; as Protestants we welcome the instructive fact that in this instance the persistent policy of Pius IX. has been totally reversed by the title bestowed on a divine who regarded the dogma of the Pope's infallibility as 'the work of an aggressive insolent faction,' and as an assertion 'which he could not logically maintain in the face of historical facts')—Cardinal Newman has declared that to Scott the commentator he owed his own self, and his earliest pilgrimage was to Aston Sandford.

But this is not the point to which, in speaking of the general movement of the nineteenth century, it is most important to call attention. The Oxford school has itself derived some of its most persuasive elements, not from those points in which it differs, but from those points in which it agrees, with the liberal and historical impulse which long preceded it, whilst it owes its exclusive peculiarities to an intense revolt against every kind of latitude.

As a separate school of thought, no doubt it sprang into existence, not as a religious or philosophical tendency, but as a political reaction against the panic which the Reform Bill created, and which shook even so robust a mind as that of the historian Hallam, and so practical a statesman as the late Lord Derby. Its thoroughly political origin may be inferred from the fact that the day which Cardinal Newman long observed as the birthday of the movement was the day on which a sermon was preached before the University of Oxford against the suppression of the ten bishoprics of the overgrown Irish Establishment. This political antagonism, combined with fierce antipathy to Liberals in every form and to Nonconformists of every denomination, formed the prevailing colour of the earliest 'Tracts for the Times.' 'I had fierce

‘ thoughts against the Liberals ’ was the inspiring thought of the leader and of his followers.

But there were points in which the school could not escape the nobler influences of the age in which it was born. That æsthetic and antiquarian tendency which Walter Scott had inaugurated, and which, as regards the details of architecture, derived its first stimulus from the Quaker Rickman, penetrated not only such wide historical minds as Arnold or Macaulay, but was taken up, perhaps with exaggeration, but still with laudable activity, by the Camden Society at Cambridge, and by the Architectural Society at Oxford. Again, the larger moral influences which descended from the latitudinarians of the commencement of the eighteenth century, and were continued through the divines of the period of George II., to reappear in the early Oriel school, did not fail to exercise a spell over the minds of the chief leaders of the Oxford movement. What is it which has made the ‘ Christian Year ’ so much more truly a representative expression of the piety of the nineteenth century than either the previous effusions of Watts or Wesley, or even than its own successor, not less instinct with poetic life, the ‘ *Lyra Innocentium* ’ ? It is not the occasional bursts of ecclesiastical doctrine, but the high moral tone such as might have been inspired by a Tillotson, the strong love for natural beauty which was almost avowedly derived from Wordsworth, the broad historical and geographical sympathies which the author shared, in spite of his long-interrupted friendship, with Arnold. What was it again that drew admiring students, with that rapt attention which Principal Shairp has so well described, round Dr. Newman at Oxford ? Partly, no doubt, circumstances which we shall trace as we proceed, but chiefly the grasp of ethical precepts, the appeals to conscience, the sincere conviction of the value of purity and generosity, in which many of his hearers recognised the reverberations, in a more subtle, though not in a more commanding form, of those stirring discourses which had thrilled them from the pulpit of Rugby.

We have ventured to give a general description of the relation of the Oxford school to the wider religious revival of which it attempts to ignore the existence, because thus only can we appreciate its comparative insignificance, and thus only can we place in proper perspective the several figures in its history whom we now intend to place before our readers.

The Oxford movement began in the consultation of a few friends in the house of Mr. Hugh James Rose at Hadleigh. It was, as we have already noticed, in its origin entirely poli-

tical ; it was intended to meet the inroads of Liberalism which appeared to have been let loose by the Reform Bill of 1831, and the advent to power of the Whig Ministry. All the efforts of Dr. Newman and his followers were at first directed in this channel. Sir Robert Peel was denounced after his appearance on the public scene in the character of a Conservative-Liberal, partly in Whitehall Chapel as Pontius Pilate, partly by Mr. Newman himself in a series of sarcastic letters addressed to the 'Times.'

But the ecclesiastical element in the movement gradually, though not exclusively, superseded this political fervour. The apostolical succession, the revival of obsolete rubrics, together with one or two Patristic tendencies, such as the doctrine of reserve and of mysticism, were the staple of their teaching. It is curious to look back upon the trivial elements which produced so much excitement. But the authors were much more important than the publication of their tracts. First amongst the chiefs the world has now correctly placed Dr. Newman himself. The enthusiasm which gathered to the feet of Dr. Newman the choicest of the Oxford students penetrated into regions where his ecclesiastical sympathies could have had little attraction. This enthusiasm was partly created by the wonderful charm of his mysterious and almost unknown personality, as it then appeared, to the mass of the academical youth. In those days the gulf between the elder and the younger portion of the Oxford world had not been bridged over, as it is now, by the more genial influences which have exercised so salutary an effect over the rising generation. They knew but little of the great leader, except by the intonations of that marvellous voice and the strongly marked features of that memorable countenance. His intercourse with the junior men was almost entirely confined to those of his own college or selected by his own peculiar predilections. It is, perhaps, to the credit of the leaders that so little of active proselytism entered into the line of their strategy. When from time to time rumours arose that he had seceded into the rival Church, there was a hurrying to and fro amongst the younger students—an awful apprehension as of some dire calamity which could only be compared to the scene in the Grecian tragedy where the chorus represents, by its terrified gestures and broken ejaculations, the murder of Medea's children behind the scenes. But there was no contact with the hidden springs of action which controlled the movements of this inscrutable personage. The house at Littlemore, to which he retired in his later years, became the subject of

curiosity bordering on impertinence; but it was curiosity, not only, as is stated in the 'Apologia,' dictated by a hostile feeling, but inspired by a sentiment of irresistible awe, to ascertain the real nature of his place of retirement and devotion.

His sermons owed their attraction, as we have already observed, to their ethical character. They bore an impress of purely literary form which was then almost unknown amongst the theologians of England. They are almost entirely free from the barbarous solecisms and scholasticisms which disfigure the writings of Pearson in the seventeenth, of Milner in the eighteenth, or of Chalmers in the nineteenth century. They may lack the vigour and originality of Arnold. They may fall short of the wide sweep or comprehensive grasp of Frederick Robertson. But they contain specimens of refined eloquence, of deep poetic pathos, peculiar to themselves. Such passages as the description of music in his University sermons, as the pathetic farewell to his Protestant friends and his Oxford associates in the address entitled 'Parting of Friends,' or his description of the Agony in the Garden or of Dives in the parable in the 'Discourses to Mixed Congregations,' published since his conversion to Rome, are derived, not from the polemical but from the genius of our time; they belong to universal literature, not to provincial dogma. Again, his pastoral ministrations were never disfigured in the slightest degree by that mixture of Parisian fashions and senseless imitations of the Roman system which occupy the whole mind of many of his followers in the English Church in our time. The despised parish clerk and the abhorred black gown were still the outward instruments by which the great preacher of Oxford addressed himself to the senses of his disciples. The modern imitation of a dead language by an unintelligible utterance which makes it impossible for the worshippers to understand the majestic language and the sublime ideas of the Prayer Book and the Bible, had no place in the teaching of the mighty artist whose rational, audible, dramatic, and impressive tones made his hearers for ever remember the prayers and lessons to which they had listened from his lips. Not Luther nor Wesley could have desired more in the way of soul-awakening delivery. There was no eastward position, without which, according to modern ecclesiastics, the sacrament itself is almost invalid; there was no incense thrown; there was no surplice curtailed of its natural proportions; there was no water mixed with wine, unless for the somewhat dubious pretext that the undiluted liquor 'distressed the stomach of' the communicants.' The sacrament was administered almost

in Presbyterian form to the worshippers who knelt, not at the table, but encircling the whole of the chancel of St. Mary's in a form which had probably descended from the time of the Puritans. Such was the figure which swayed the minds of Oxford during the close of the first half of this century.

If we pass from the manner to the substance of his teaching, there is much more opening for question. It may be doubted whether in the whole range of historical or theological thought there is a single subject on which he has left his permanent mark. It was perhaps hardly to be expected that there should be. His mind ran in another groove than that of speculation or research. The notes on Athanasius are excellent; the illustrations from his 'Essay on Development' pierce like a sword; but the 'History of the Arians' gives no idea of the time, and his Lectures on Justification leave no trace on the mind.

A vehement dispute raged in later times between him and Charles Kingsley, the one affirming, the other denying, the charge brought that truth for its own sake was not the object of the human intellect. If by that charge was meant a want of truthfulness in the ordinary sense of veracity, it is sufficiently disproved by the account given in the 'Apologia' of his own life; but if, as is evident, although stated by Mr. Kingsley in a clumsy and blundering manner, was intended the belief that truth is not a legitimate object of human research, then the charge is not only true, but is fully avowed in the closing section of that remarkable book. The human mind, in Dr. Newman's view, cannot be trusted in its pursuit of truth 'actually and historically;' its tendency is towards a simple unbelief in matters of religion; no truth, however sacred, can stand against it in the long run. It was a deadly struggle which has been well compared to the single combat between Roderick Dhu and James FitzJames—the savage thrusts of the one, and the adroit fencing of the other—and there are bitter passages on both sides of which both probably in their cooler moments would have repented. But viewing the controversy after the calm of a quarter of a century, whilst we sympathise with the eagerness with which the opportunity was seized of vindicating a personal honour which was felt to have been rudely assailed, we must admit that there was a tortuous mode of pursuing his purposes which, though consistent with absolute sincerity, may naturally have given birth at the time to some sinister suspicions. It was owing no doubt in part to the difficulty of his position, constantly shifting under him, that Dr. Newman had recourse to the practice of whispering, like the slave of Midas, his secret into the reeds

in the hope that some future traveller might peradventure discover it. Thus, for example, he has himself described in his 'Apologia' how he retracted the harsh things he had said against the Church of Rome—without his name, but so that anyone could perceive that it was his own act, and in an obscure newspaper called 'The Conservative Journal,' which no one has ever read before or since. And the same tendency may be discovered from time to time in his later writings: as, for example, when he drops without a word, but yet with a significance which is worth many words, in a footnote to the 'Grammar of Assent,' how Petavius has told us that the doctrine of eternal punishment has never been defined in the Catholic Church; or again, when in the appendix to his treatise on the Arians he describes the complications, the contradictions, and the intricacies of the theological terms of the fourth century with an amplitude of detail which justifies all, and more than all, that liberal theologians have said concerning them; or again, when, in constructing an elaborate system of the scholastic doctrines of the Trinity, he rests his foundation on the verse which is known by every scholar not to be genuine. It is not the desire of concealment, for no one could possibly be deceived; it is rather, if we may put such a construction upon it, a desire in strict candour to leave on record, though in a concealed form, that the opposite view had at least so much to be said in its favour.

From the spirit of critical enquiry which, with all its defects, has produced the greatest light that ever has been thrown on Biblical literature, from the school which has produced in Germany a Ewald, in France a Reuss, in England a Lightfoot, Dr. Newman turned deliberately away. The German researches which were a second birth to Arnold and Thirlwall had, with one exception, no effect on the leaders of the Oxford movement. There is hardly a single passage in all Dr. Newman's writings, except indirectly and by his marvellous grace of diction, which has furnished the smallest contribution to the better understanding of the text of the Bible. It is a matter of interesting speculation what would have been the course of the Oxford movement had that subtle intellect exerted itself in earlier years to master the German language. There is a common impression prevailing that Cardinal Newman's conversion to the Roman Church was a rebound from the distractions of a mind torn by the critical doubts of the age, 'soaring,' as Bishop Wilberforce expressed it, 'on the wings of an unbounded scepticism into the depths of an unfathomable superstition.' We see no trace of this tendency.

With singular transparency he has laid open to us the whole course of his mind, from earliest childhood to the moment of his decisive change. We see strange beliefs in his earliest years concerning crosses and books and angels haunting the forms of nature or the ways of man; but we see no trace of his mind having ever been disturbed by what are called the agonies of scepticism. With his acuteness he could not but perceive the various arguments by which religion has been in all ages assaulted by this or that distinguished combatant; but he saw them as an intellectual curiosity, not as a force which disturbed his own peace of mind. He has given to us the two main causes of his secession: one was the foundation of the Jerusalem bishopric,* and the other was an article of Cardinal Wiseman drawing an analogy between the Church of England and the related Monophysite Church of Africa to that of Rome.† On no mind sceptically or critically inclined could either of these instances have weighed with the slightest effect.

We pass for a moment to the other leaders of the school. The author of the 'Christian Year' has by that work of devotional poetry won for himself a place amongst the classical writers of England. It is in vain to disparage the genius of a poet whose book has reached the ninetieth edition; a book often obscure in language, always removed from mere popular feeling, but containing touches of genuine sympathy for nature and for history, which give it a unique place between the hymnology and the poetry of the nation. The 'Christian Year' was published before the formation of the Oxford movement; it commanded the attention of scholars and theologians who had not the smallest sympathy with Keble's ecclesiastical views. His other writings were of a different order. His edition of Hooker and his Life of Bishop Wilson are models of painstaking labour, which probably he would hardly have cared in later years to expend on the author of 'Ecclesiastical Polity,' had he come into contact then with his Erastian proclivities, or had he been fully alive to the rough style of Bishop Wilson's penances on the criminals in the Isle of Man, or the plain and homely style of the 'Maxims,' which, indeed, he never once mentions, but which his famous godson Matthew Arnold has exalted to a high place amongst the English moralists. He declared with extraordinary vehemence that most of the men who had difficulties respecting the mechanical view of Biblical inspiration were too

* Newman's 'Apologia,' pp. 252, 253.

† Ibid. p. 212.

wicked to be reasoned with. He maintained to the end a rigid adherence to ecclesiastical tradition, and, with a sagacity which was not altogether misplaced, he was one of those who to the last adhered to Mr. Gladstone, declaring that after all he was 'only a clergyman in a blue coat.' Still it was as a poet, rather than as a polemic, that John Keble will always be known, and the 'Christian Year' and the 'Lyra Innocentium' and the translation of the Psalter will keep his name alive in many households long after the Oxford movement has run its course. He rests in the churchyard at Hursley amongst the simple peasants of Hampshire. The college bearing his name in Oxford is the trophy of the party to which he had adhered with unshaken fidelity; but his memorial as a poet in Westminster Abbey was raised entirely by the enthusiasm of one who shared none of his theological views—the lamented and accomplished scholar, Edward Twisleton.

There was a third leader, on whose career we hardly touch because, unlike that of Keble and Newman, it is not yet ended in the English Church. Dr. Pusey, in his eighty-second year, still retains his intellectual vigour; he still continues immovably fixed both by conviction and by sentiment in the Church which nurtured his earliest years. He also, like Dr. Newman, is a standing witness, even to this day, of the hollowness of those cries for postures and vestures which have made the name of his party so conspicuous in these later times. He never in his own person has condescended to any of those trivialities, although at times he has appeared as the champion of younger partisans whose fancies he does not share. In one respect, however, he stood alone, or almost alone, amongst the leaders of the party. He was deeply learned in all the learning of the Germans. His earliest work was a defence of them against Hugh James Rose, who had made what he conceived an unfair assault on German theology; and though he has long since repudiated that book and attacked those who have followed in the track which it suggested, yet it remains a monument of the indefatigable penetrating scientific industry which he then acquired. Of all English lecture-rooms the one which most inspired the student with a sense of a German atmosphere was the library of Dr. Pusey, where, amidst piles of vellum folios and unbound octavos, he poured forth a torrent of quotations equally from the Fathers and the latest German divines, and pursued the meaning of the Hebrew name of a caterpillar or a gazelle with as much philological ardour as Gesenius or De Wette. The laborious and instructive edition of the Minor Prophets is the one

footprint which German theology has left on the Oxford school.

These were the chief leaders whose names are known to the English public. Hurrell Froude, the elder brother of the historian, was cut off too early to enable us to form any conception of what his ultimate influence on the party would have been. We have only the torso-like monument of a singularly powerful and impetuous mind presented to us in the strange publication of his remains by Dr. Newman and Mr. Keble, and we have his brother's striking testimony that of all men whom he ever saw he combined the most remarkable union of moral and intellectual qualities.

The progress of the movement was not unchequered. We omit its intervening stages, and dwell only on the culminating point of its success and the culminating point of its overthrow, which will serve to illustrate its peculiar characteristics. Its culminating point of success was in the year 1836, before its members had lost the confidence of the great Conservative party of which they had been the ecclesiastical representatives, and when they brought their whole power to oppose the nomination of Dr. Hampden by a Liberal Ministry to the Regius Professorship of Divinity at Oxford. Then it was that Arnold, in this *Journal*, stood forth an almost solitary champion against their combinations, and attacked them with all his usual vigour and more than his usual vehemence for an attempt to crush in its progress the beginnings of a Liberal theology at Oxford. It is this attempt which gives interest to that struggle. Dr. Hampden will remain a singular example of a man on whom ecclesiastical persecution produced the effect of stifling the flame of intellectual energy. In his Bampton Lectures on the Scholastic Philosophy, he had stated with consummate ability the manner in which that philosophy had interwoven itself with all the fibres of theological speculation, and he then, terrified by the unexpected clamour which this endeavour created, withdrew into himself*—remained an obscure and inactive professor, and became afterwards a quiet and inoffensive bishop except when he went out of his way to denounce those who in their time had become the victims of theological obloquy. But this does not diminish the merit of his first work, which all later research and speculation has

* A theory, we are convinced totally groundless, was suggested to account for this phenomenon, that the Bampton Lectures were really the work of Blanco White. A comparison of Blanco White's writings with the few other works of Dr. Hampden before 1836 is decisive.

justified and illustrated. 'Ten years hence,' said Dr. Newman, in the 'Elucidations' which he published (we do not here enquire whether fairly or unfairly extracted) of the Bampton Lectures, 'those who are no way protesting against Dr. Hampden's appointment now will, if then alive, feel they had upon them a responsibility greater than had been incurred by the members of this university for many centuries.' More than forty years have now elapsed, and most intelligent students will acknowledge that the acute remarks of Dr. Hampden afford the best solution of many of the perplexities in which Christian theology has been involved.

This effort, made by a combination of discordant elements against the common foe, as it was regarded, of Liberal Christianity, was the last display of the school which carried the Church with it. From that time its chiefs and disciples became involved in successive conflicts. The publication, to which we have already alluded, of the remains of Hurrell Froude opened the eyes of the Protestant world to their danger. Even the persecuted Professor of 1836 was enabled to avenge himself by compelling candidates for theological degrees to debate on topics to them studiously offensive. 'We are disputing daily,' said a witty sufferer, 'in the school of one Tyrannus.'

At length in the year 1841 a blow was struck which left no room for any further doubt. At this time the Thirty-nine Articles, fenced round as they then were with an array of formidable subscriptions, appeared to furnish an impregnable barrier against what were supposed to be the errors of Rome. It was suddenly disclosed that these barriers were overthrown, and that the Articles, from the sixth to the thirty-seventh, had fallen like a house of cards before the subtle and destructive analysis of the famous Tract XC. It was a 'plea for toleration' in the same sense as that in which the cry has been raised in later years, or as it was raised in the reign of James II. Whilst demanding for the Romanising party within the English Church all the liberty that could be achieved by this analysis, it held out no signal of relief to the consciences that were groaning under the yoke of subscription which the wiser legislation of later times has swept away. The clamour was widespread; it appeared that even the illustrious author of the whole Tract movement would be obliged in some way to succumb before it. At that time the members of the Oxford school still believed in the authority of bishops; the fierce resistance which they now oppose to episcopal utterances, even on the smallest question of eccle-

siastical drapery, was then quite unknown. There presided over the diocese of Oxford a prelate known for his generous and genial habits, but also for an easy-going indifference to his diocesan duties, who was persuaded on this occasion to demand from Dr. Newman that the 'Tracts for the Times,' the chief literary instrument of the movement, should be suspended. Dr. Newman at once acceded to his request; he was not insensible to the expressions of episcopal authority nor to the gratitude prompted by the manner in which the prohibition was worded. It is singular that amongst all the prelates of his time, distinguished in various ways, *for piety, for learning, and for ability, 'Dick Bagot,' as he was familiarly called, is the one bishop whom Dr. Newman has singled out from the whole episcopal bench for his emphatic approbation. 'May his memory be for ever blessed!' is the exclamation in which the somewhat exaggerated feeling of later years finds its natural vent.

The Protestant suspicions of the country were not, however, thus to be lulled. In the year 1844 the Hebdomadal Board, at that time the governing body of the University of Oxford, were again roused by the repetition of Tract XC. on a bolder scale. This introduces us to a nearer view of a man who at this juncture, although he is not mentioned even by allusion in Dr. Newman's 'Apologia,' exercised the most constant and energetic influence over all the ramifications of the party, and especially over the younger men; who, by his unrivalled powers of argument, by his transparent candour, by his uncompromising pursuit of the opinions which he had adopted, and by his loyal devotion to Dr. Newman himself, was the most important element of the Oxford school at this crisis. This was Mr. Ward. In the summer of 1844 he published a work entitled 'The Ideal of a Christian Church.' This work stated without reserve the conclusion which in Tract XC. had been partly veiled by the peculiar style of its powerful author, that every Roman doctrine might be held within the limits of the English Church. The question originally stated by Tract XC. again forced itself on the Oxford authorities. The polemics against this invasion of the Thirty-nine Articles were of a threefold kind. The first was a test by which it was asserted that the Articles for the future must be accepted, not according to the subtle explanations of the nineteenth century, but according to the rigid definitions of the sixteenth. It laid down that, whenever subscribed at the University of Oxford, they must be accepted in that sense in which they had been originally uttered and in which the

University imposed them. A second class consisted of the decrees pronounced against Mr. Ward himself, that he should be censured for this deviation from his subscriptions, and that, if found guilty, he should be deprived of all his degrees and reduced to the state of an undergraduate. The third piece of artillery that ultimately was brought to bear was a revival of the attack on *Tract XC.* itself. The elaboration of this system of attack was concerted in the October term of 1844. It was kept a profound secret during three long autumnal months, and the secret was broken only by one of those extraordinary incidents which occur now and then in fiction, but rarely in actual life. These documents, having been sent to London for a legal opinion, were diverted from their proper destination in the post-office at Oxford, and inserted in a parcel of college leases addressed to one of the most enthusiastic followers of Dr. Newman and Mr. Ward. The secret thus disclosed was in honour kept by the astonished recipient, but it was not in human nature but that particles of the information, thus unexpectedly acquired, should leak out in answer to perpetual enquiries. Through this channel it gradually transpired that a great and final onslaught was to be made on the citadel of the fortress. At last, just before the Christmas vacation of that year, all doubts were at an end, and they were published in formidable array before the Oxford world separated for their holidays to meet again in time for the day when the deadly blow was to be struck.

From most of Dr. Newman's adherents a cry of anguish went up against it; but another opposition, of a different spirit, arose from a section of the clergy and the community who were indignant at this attempt by a strict definition of subscription to abridge the liberties of the English Church. This was the Liberal party of the Church of England—a party which from the days of Lord Falkland had never been extinct, which continued, as we have observed, through the eighteenth century, but which made themselves heard on this occasion by those who, under the influence of Arnold, had become firmly possessed of the idea of the latitude intended and required by a national Church. One who has since been raised to the highest post in that Church, and who has united in that position the liberality and the firmness which he showed on this occasion, generously put aside his former objections to the celebrated *Tract*, and issued a powerful and convincing protest against the danger of enforcing this new test on the whole Church of England. Mr. Maurice, forgiving all the obloquy with which he had been loaded by the High Church party,

came forward at the same time. Professor Donkin, the most serene, unimpassioned intellect of Oxford, whose untimely death the Liberal ranks have never ceased to deplore, wrote a short and trenchant pamphlet on the subject. Mr. Hull, the venerable opponent of the Athanasian Creed, became the champion of the party now placed in so much danger of being themselves the victims of a popular clamour. Arnold, who had two years before been taken to his rest, was known to have declared that if ever the author of Tract XC. should be brought before a promiscuous tribunal similar to that which had condemned Dr. Hampden, he would certainly have voted in the ranks of his supporters. Milman, from his retreat in the cloisters of Westminster, loudly protested against the impolicy of the whole proceeding. Two younger members of the Liberal school, who have since risen to high positions in the University and the Church, were ceaselessly employed, during the whole of the winter preceding the final attack, in endeavouring to avert it. They drew up an opinion by which the illegality of the new test was in their opinion proved, and submitted it to a distinguished lawyer, since raised to the highest rank of his profession. The Hebdomadal Board quailed before an attack which was fired upon them from both sides, and they withdrew the first branch of the assault on the day when this legal opinion became known to the world. Long months afterwards, the notice proclaiming the opinion of Sir Roundell Palmer continued to be read on every post and on every wall within distance of the University.

The excitement now centred on Mr. Ward. The air was filled with pamphlets and broadsides. The old High Church party with its prejudices, the Evangelical party with its natural hostility to anything which bore a semblance to Roman doctrine, were all united against the enemy. It was rumoured that Bishop Phillpotts wrote to the Hebdomadal Board expressing his intention of voting against Mr. Ward, but—that he needed proof of his being the author of the book. At last came the memorable day which must be regarded as the closing scene of the conflict of the first Oxford movement. It was February 13, St. Valentine's Eve. It was a day in itself sufficiently marked by the violent passions seething within Oxford itself, and aggravated to the highest pitch by the clergy and laity of all shades and classes who crowded the colleges and inns of Oxford for the great battle of Armageddon which was to take place in the Convocation of Oxford, that day assembled in the Sheldonian Theatre. The agitation penetrated to the very servants and scouts. They stood ranged round the

doors of their colleges waiting for the issue of the writ, filled with the 'gaudia certaminis.' 'Theirs not to reason why.' The excitement of the day was yet more fiercely accentuated by one of the most tremendous snowstorms which had down to that time taken place within the memory of man. Fast and thick fell the flakes amidst the whirlwinds which snatched them up and hurried them to and fro. Two academics who, on the night before, had arrived at Swindon, in the hope of finding shelter on that pitiless night, found every bed and every corner occupied; yet such was their ardour for the fray that they walked that dismal journey to be in time for the fatal hour. The undergraduates, who ardently participated in the excitement of their seniors, watched the procession, as it passed under their windows, with mingled howls and cheers; and one of them, of more impetuosity than the rest, climbed to the top of the Radcliffe Library, and from that secure position pelted the Vice-Chancellor with a shower of snowballs to testify his detestation of the obnoxious measure.

When the whole assembly of upwards of 1,000 voters was crowded within the theatre, packed as closely as the area of that splendid building would permit, the Registrar of the University read out the incriminating passages of the 'Ideal of the Christian Church.' Grown wiser, and, we may add, more just, by the experience of the attacks on Dr. Hampden, they did not condemn the whole book, but certain extracts which were chosen from it. The general proceedings were in Latin, but it was curious to hear the grave voice of the Registrar proclaiming in the vernacular from his high position these several sentences—'O most joyful! O 'most wonderful! O most unexpected sight! we find the whole 'cycle of Roman doctrine gradually possessing numbers of 'English Churchmen!' Once again the English language was permitted to be heard in that assembly; the Vice-Chancellor rose in his place and announced in Latin that by the permission of the Chancellor, to Mr. Ward, and to Mr. Ward alone, was to be given the privilege of using in his own defence his native tongue. Then followed the apology for the book, at that time known in its every part, now probably become one of the obsolete curiosities of literature. It consisted of an effective address, challenging all parties in the Church equally to vindicate their subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, and calling upon him who was without fault to throw the first stone. The time, however, for argument was past. In that infuriated assembly, infuriated on both sides by the passions of the contending parties, action was the only course. One or two

speeches in Latin were vainly endeavoured to be heard amidst the prevailing roar. The vote of censure on the obnoxious passages in the book was carried, and Mr. Ward was condemned to have all his degrees taken ignominiously from him.

Then came the third engine of attack, which was a censure of Tract XC. itself. That censure, promulgated within a fortnight of the time of its execution, had roused some of the protests to which we have before referred, of which we cannot help recalling one which for its tragic pathos deserved more than ephemeral consideration—a pamphlet or broadside written in defence of Dr. Newman by his attached and faithful friend, the present Lord Blachford. In spite of all opposition, however, the authorities pressed on their measure, and at the close of this stormy day the condemnation of Tract XC. was read. Every eye was fixed on the two proctors who claimed the constitutional veto confided to them on every act that came before the University. That right had been exercised once before in the case of the attack on Dr. Hampden. There were at that time two Liberal proctors, who had taken upon themselves to stay what they deemed an iniquitous measure. A broadside, published under the title of ‘*Nemesis*,’ had called attention to the fact that the same position which was occupied by those two officers on the former occasion was now occupied by two officers in the opposite camp, whose courage and magnanimity would be equal to the occasion. They rose in their places, one of them the present Dean of St. Paul’s, and uttered the celebrated words only on that one previous occasion heard within the memory of man—‘*Nobis procuratoribus non placet.*’ Thus the measure which after all would have been most fatal to the existence of the Oxford party was for a time warded off. But Easter was at hand; the two proctors, whose independence had stood firm on this occasion, would be out of office, and their position taken by men possibly of another stamp. In order to fortify the opinion favourable to the veto of the outgoing proctors, a vote of thanks to them for their conduct was drawn up and signed by almost every man whose name has since become conspicuous in the Liberal ranks of the Church of England.

The contest had reached a white heat—lawsuits, prosecutions of every kind were talked of—the weapons of both parties were drawn and sharpened—when suddenly the Oxford movement collapsed at its centre. This is not the place or time to describe the entirely personal reason of a defeat so singular and so total; suffice it to say that it was a defeat in which the sense of the ludicrous aspect prevailed over every

other feeling, and the fierce passions of eager controversialists became displaced by the wholly unexpected entrance of a spirit of another kind. It is instructive and perhaps consoling to observe that the one agitation which more than any other of our time threatened to rend asunder the English Church was reduced to insignificant proportions by an event wholly outside the circle of theological arguments.

It may also be remarked that the Liberal party, although not organised or united as in later times, yet proved itself faithful to the traditions which it has ever since occupied, especially in this Journal. Its members were animated by a common spirit of generosity towards their fallen foes, and of impartiality in an exciting theological crisis. It is characteristic of the party whom they befriended in this desperate conflict that not the smallest gratitude was shown towards them by those who had benefited by their support. Cardinal Newman himself has even gone so far as to place the whole responsibility of his expulsion from Oxford on his Liberal opponents: 'The Liberals drove me from Oxford; it was they who had opened the attack on Tract XC., and it was they who gained a second benefit if I went on to retire from the Anglican Church.' This statement, as we have seen, is entirely inaccurate. Two or three of the elder Liberals may have instigated the attack; but the great majority of the assailants were the old dogmatical opponents of Dr. Hampden, and the mass of those who afterwards became most important in the ranks of the Liberal party were foremost amongst the men who, by their self-denying efforts, succeeded in warding off the measures which would have made it impossible for him to retain his position in the Anglican Church.

We have described the subsidence of the general agitation. Its effect was completed by the secession which took place in the latter part of the year 1845, and which left the party, as a party, entirely prostrate in the seat of its original movement. For some years the University and the Church returned to their natural equilibrium; theological study again began to flourish, and schemes of academic improvement occupied the chief place in the minds of those who were disengaged from the violent strain put upon them by the late tempest of controversy. Freedom of thought gradually reasserted its claims, and there was no direct effort to thwart or to repress it. But the serpent (we use the word in no offensive sense) was scotched and not killed. In 1850 Bishop Phillpotts commenced the onslaught on Mr. Gorham which, had it been successful, would have expelled the Evangelical

party from the Church. The polemical passions of the party at Oxford were roused from their slumbers, and the failure of that attempt stirred the smouldering ashes, and from that period onwards to the present time there has been a constant though varying addition to its forces and its organised strength.

It was in this second stage of the Oxford school that a conspicuous character appeared who must be regarded as one of the chief historical figures of the English Church and especially of the High Church party during this recrudescence of its existence. It is one marked distinction between the former and the latter stage of the movement that, as a general rule, no eminent characters were directly connected with it. One most powerful preacher was in its foremost ranks. The still surviving leaders of the original war exercised an influence over it. But the rank and file were but ordinary minds, and these had to seek for a leader one who was not of them, but who by his brilliant qualities and his strategical statesmanship made up for his want of genuine sympathy. In 1846 Samuel Wilberforce had become Bishop of Oxford. It is too early to form a deliberate judgment of the character of that remarkable man. The single volume that has appeared relates only to the earlier period of his life and episcopate down to the year 1848. Still, the peculiarity of his relations to the party requires that we should consider his whole position.

Mr. Ashwell, whose premature death in the midst of his labours is sincerely to be lamented, has executed his task on the whole with judgment and fidelity. He has brought out with touching force the tenderness of the Bishop's domestic character, particularly the persistent and ever-fresh sorrow with which the death of his wife was constantly remembered in the record of his thoughts and actions, which appears in the long succession of entries, with consummate skill arranged from the Diary by Mr. Ashwell from the time of her removal in 1841,* down to the very eve of the Bishop's own sudden death in 1873. He has also brought out, in forms which we imagine will be startling to many of his readers, the repugnance which during this earlier period of his life he entertained towards the leaders of the Oxford school. The letters between himself and Dr. Newman† and Dr. Pusey‡ in this portion of his career are as instructive on one side as on the other. He voted in favour of the repressive measures which we have already noticed against Mr. Ward; and his whole language

* Life of Bishop Wilberforce, vol. i. pp. 180-192.

† Ibid. p. 125.

‡ Ibid. pp. 300-310.

on the subject, particularly in the correspondence which passed between him and Mr. Gladstone on occasion of the disputed election to the Poetry professorship, is decisive on the tendency of his opinions at that particular crisis. In the ardour with which he urged the claims of Mr. Maurice* we see the momentary gleam of wider sympathies. The attitude which he assumed on the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the see of Hereford is, perhaps, the most significant expression of his relations to the Oxford school at this juncture. His opposition to the nomination was no doubt aggravated and complicated by the characteristic endeavour to make himself master of the situation by appealing alternately to the Prime Minister, the Professor, and his various friends in the High Church party, in the hope that he might bring them round to his successive views.† Even this was quite consistent with the hostility which he displayed to Dr. Hampden's appointment in the year 1836, and the generally conservative character which had marked all his actions and speeches down to this time. But the conclusion of the controversy betrayed that vacillation or mutability which, however explained, was one of the persistent features of his course. Mr. Ashwell has faithfully given us all the correspondence which passed in what he justly regards as a critical period in the Bishop's career, when, after having vehemently opposed the nomination of Dr. Hampden by Lord John Russell, he finally withdrew that opposition on the ground that he had for the first time read the Bampton Lectures, and had found nothing in them but what was capable of an innocent interpretation.‡ A powerful letter from Bishop Phillpotts is inserted in Mr. Ashwell's pages,§ and it represents well the mixture of surprise and indignation which was felt by the whole High Church party on his desertion of their ranks at the moment of sorest need. Under one aspect this correspondence reveals the Bishop in a somewhat favourable point of view, inasmuch as he expressed openly what, no doubt, had been the feeling of others who had not the courage to avow it; but there remains the fatal flaw, which neither Bishop Phillpotts

* Life, vol. i. p. 313; comp. pp. 212, 213.

† The only two persons who came well out of this curious correspondence are Lord John Russell and the venerable Provost of Oriel. Their letters are admirable. Archbishop Howley's conduct is left in doubt. He certainly did not express any disapproval of the appointment, and he died before the consecration.

‡ Life, vol. i. p. 88.

§ Ibid. p. 489.

nor Mr. Ashwell recognises, that by his own avowal he had pursued Dr. Hampden with the utmost vehemence of theological hostility, both in the earlier period of 1836 when he voted for the censure which was intended to inflict deep injury on his character as a professor, and again when he became the life and soul of the opposition to him in 1847, without having studied the very book on which alone any such opposition could be founded. It is, no doubt, a common vice of theological controversy, and many men have been guilty of it besides Bishop Wilberforce; but this example of the carelessness, to say the least, with which popular judgments in moments of theological panic have been maintained and pursued, is a striking instance of the futility of all such judgments in themselves. It is difficult to unravel the motives which may have operated to produce such a charge and such an avowal. The estrangement produced by this untoward event no doubt diminished, for a time, the influence which the Bishop of Oxford would otherwise have exercised over the movement of Church affairs. Soon, however, an opportunity occurred for his regaining that influence in a preponderating form, and in a manner for which his antecedents could hardly have prepared us, by assuming the chief control of the government of the Oxford movement in that second stage to which we have called attention. From this time forward he was the most conspicuous representative, not indeed of that party in some of its wilder excesses, but of its general aspirations and desires.

There were many causes which contributed to this prominence. In the first place he was animated by an activity and ubiquity almost preternatural. It is, no doubt, a great exaggeration when in Mr. Ashwell's pages, as throughout the manifestations of what may be called the High Church hagiology, he is represented as the one prelate who restored to the Church the ideal of an active bishop. These same qualities in the most conspicuous form, and without special regard to any peculiar ecclesiastical bias, had been shown in the episcopate of the English Church long before. Bishop Burnet had already exhibited these qualities on a scale and in a spirit which Lord Macaulay has well described, and which go far to entitle him to the honour of being the founder of an energetic English episcopate. Bishop Sumner of Chester, Bishop Blomfield of London, Bishop Ryder, and afterwards Bishop Lonsdale of Lichfield, together with others whom we do not name in this noble succession, but who exhibited a zeal which penetrated into all their dioceses, had broken through the legacy of apathy and indolence which, as we have observed, the latter half of the

eighteenth century had bequeathed to us, and which characterised the times of Cornwallis and Bathurst.

Bishop Wilberforce was only one in a bright constellation of prelates, and his merit or his good fortune was, not that he was the first to discharge these duties so efficiently and so zealously, but that, owing to his multifarious and diversified qualities, he illuminated them with a splendour which may be called his own, and exhibited them on a large scale before the world. He succeeded to the diocese so long presided over by that prelate whom, in spite of Dr. Newman's eulogium, it would be absurd to regard as a model of exemplary episcopal activity; and he almost may be said to have created it anew, both mechanically and spiritually. When he ultimately left the diocese of Oxford for that of Winchester, although by that time his fire had a good deal spent itself, one who knew him well, and who was not inclined to judge him too favourably, exclaimed, with a sigh, 'The romance of the diocese 'is gone.' He sought and he obtained a large popularity by his powerful and sometimes pathetic preaching, by his hospitable receptions of his clergy at Cuddesdon, by his admirable eloquence at every public meeting on behalf of charitable or ecclesiastical causes, above all by the singular grace with which he discharged the office of confirmation, whether in country parishes, or in schools, or in courtly circles. Accordingly his faults were forgotten, his virtues flattered, and he was welcomed almost as a divinity by the High Church party, who magnified these gifts, sufficiently splendid in themselves, into something of a saintly glory. With the fantastic ritual, of which we have already spoken, of the later High Church clergy, Bishop Wilberforce had but little sympathy. Though not without a love of pomp and ceremony, and a poetic sympathy with the traditional and artistic sides of the life of the Church, he yet never consented to use any of those dresses or postures which have been so strongly insisted upon in the last fifteen years as essential points of the Christian religion. The grounds on which the practice of fasting before the Holy Communion was justified, he pronounced, in almost the latest utterance which escaped from his lips, to be 'a disgusting 'superstition.' Flowers and such like trivialities, which crowded the altars of churches which he was called upon to visit, he brushed away with a contemptuous sweep of his arm. But with the stronger currents which drove through the Oxford movement he went along, if not entirely yet sufficiently to give them the countenance which they required. To the spirit of free and critical enquiry which had descended from the

first to the second stage of the Oxford school, he opposed a determined, though not always consistent, front. When the volume of 'Essays and Reviews' was attacked by both the extreme parties in the Church, with a vehemence which now it seems difficult to understand, he was the chief person by whom that agitation was stimulated and organised. The article which appeared in the 'Quarterly Review' denouncing the volume with every weapon of sarcasm, invective, and insult, it is now no secret to reveal was composed by Bishop Wilberforce. When, after several years, he encountered the author of a review which in these pages had replied to his attack, and who had never concealed the part which he had taken in resisting that formidable attempt to narrow the liberties of the English Church, the Bishop exclaimed, with that mixture of playfulness and solemnity of which he was so complete a master: 'At last, at last, the two augurs have met!' In the storm which he thus guided and controlled, he exhibited all the arts of which as a statesman and as a churchman he was capable. He even contrived by his peculiar fascination to throw a glamour for the time over the powerful intellect of Bishop Thirlwall. This, however, was only for the moment. That distinguished prelate broke loose from the bondage, and the resistance which Bishop Wilberforce encountered from him, and above all from the magnanimous and far-seeing courage of the present Archbishop of Canterbury, then Bishop of London, succeeded in his entire overthrow and ultimate acquiescence in the salutary decision of the Supreme Court of Appeal. The better spirit of the age had overmastered the counter current of the Oxford theology; and an article appeared in the 'Quarterly Review' in 1879, virtually conceding almost every point it had so fiercely combated under Bishop Wilberforce's sanction in 1851.

This was the last attempt which the Bishop made directly to counteract the spirit of liberal Christianity. But he was always on the watch to blight its progress, and he remained true to the instincts of the party which unfortunately adopted Laud's ceremonialism without his occasional latitudinarianism. Still it was with so much hesitation that we hardly know how to trace his deliberate intentions. It is, indeed, one of the remarkable parts of that singular versatility with which he was endowed, that he lent himself to every wind that blew from various quarters of the theological compass. Of the controversy with the Bishop of Natal he was at one time the chief mover, but when the time came for the consecration of a rival bishop he withdrew his encouragement and drew back into a safe

neutrality. His conduct with regard to the same series of incidents in the Lambeth Conference was a bitter disappointment to the highly wrought ambition of Bishop Gray of Cape-town. The Athanasian Creed, which at times he was willing to sweep out of the Liturgy, and to place in obscurity amongst the Thirty-nine Articles, or again, which he was prepared to leave in the Liturgy omitting the rubric which enjoins its use, at other times in obedience to the dictates of party he was eager to maintain in its present position. The appointment of Bishop Temple to the see of Exeter, which at first he had welcomed with overflowing zeal, he was ready to abandon in deference to the panic of the section of the clergy that he patronised. It is not too much to say that partly to this dangerous versatility of opposition, and partly to his subservience to feelings which he only partially shared, is owing the fatal obstruction which has succeeded in nullifying all attempts at reform of the Prayer Book. It is remarkable that in that small section of the Royal Commission on the Rubrics which devoted itself to the reform of the lectionary, where no party spirit was involved, where nothing was aimed at but drawing forth in the most attractive shape the real treasures of the Bible, there his influence and his energy were used with the most salutary effect, and there his work has substantially triumphed over opposition. When party spirit entered in, he was a totally different man, and, alas! with widely different results.

There was another point in which the Oxford school had from the first stood aloof from the best tendencies both of the eighteenth and of the nineteenth century. It was zealous in asserting the ecclesiastical as distinct from the national element of civilisation. There is a certain sense in which this sentiment was promoted by the re-opening of the continent after the great war. Then for the first time Englishmen became vividly impressed by the fact that there was a Christianity outside the British Isles. The sight of the devotion and the splendour of Roman Catholic churches awakened a sense of a common ecclesiastical or religious bond, irrespectively of politics or country; much as the acquaintance with French and Swiss Protestants enlarged the horizon of the Evangelical section of the Church, both Anglican and Presbyterian. From this a sense of a common Christendom was in various degrees engendered, apart from that larger influence of literature to which we have before adverted. He must be a very stout-hearted or hard-headed man who will not recognise the value of this influence. But the Oxford movement also developed a sense

of a corporate ecclesiastical sentiment within the nation itself, which placed the claims of the clergy in direct antagonism to the nation and the State, and which has been the parent of innumerable evils. Erastianism—that term of reproach which had hitherto hardly been known except in the mouths of the Covenanters in Walter Scott's novels—assumed for the first time a foremost place amongst the detested heresies. Dr. Newman describes how his soul was set on fire by it; and Hurrell Froude appears also to have largely been influenced in the same direction. But this feeling was not largely shared by the Oxford party in its earlier formation. It was kept in check by the strong political bias with which, as we have observed, that school had opened its existence; and the exaggerated admiration for Charles I. and Laud tended powerfully to keep the anti-Erastian party within the bounds prescribed by the Stuart divines. In fact, even in Dr. Newman's oration on his assuming the rank of a cardinal, this original regard for authority, whether secular or ecclesiastical, appears in an unmistakeable form. But when the movement reappeared in the hands of other men, and under the new influences brought to bear upon it, the antipathy grew and spread. Against the counsels of the older generation, including such men as Dean Hook, it at last succeeded in gaining the revival of Convocation; and in the wilder spirits it has taken the form of a demand for the entire separation of the Church from State control and State endowment, which is based on the strange allegory that, as the Church cannot enter into an alliance with a heathen State, as being the bride of Christ, without incurring the guilt of adultery, so further she cannot remain in connexion with a Christian State, which is the brother of Christ, without incurring the guilt of incest. These principles, no doubt, are partly shared by some of the dissenting clergy, especially in Scotland, but it is the Oxford school which has brought them to their fullest development; and it was into this development that Samuel Wilberforce threw himself—with the reservation, indeed, necessarily involved in his strong common sense and his keen worldly sympathies*—we use the word in no invidious sense—but still with sufficient energy to make himself here also the representative of a feeling which in its latest forms possessed only the fiercer members of the movement.

For one application of this principle, namely, the revival of Convocation, he must be considered as chiefly responsible. It

is generally supposed that through his influence with Lord Aberdeen that cautious statesman was induced to revive from its state of long repose a body which Burke had ominously foretold would remain dormant until some minister should 'conjure up that spirit, who will abide the consequences,' and of which Fox declared, 'I will never consent to believe that 'the national character is so degraded as ever to submit to 'the revival of Convocation in our land.'

We have now the opportunity of seeing how far the policy of Bishop Wilberforce was justified by the results. Thirty years have elapsed since the Convocation of Canterbury met for the despatch of business, and with the fortunate exception of the revision of the Authorised Version, which Convocation afterwards endeavoured, with the sanction of Bishop Wilberforce himself, to overthrow and thwart, it is difficult to point out any liberal measure which this body has not either strenuously opposed or grudgingly accepted. It is not that in these assemblies there are not persons capable of holding their own in a small minority, but the whole spirit of the institution is so uncongenial to the free play of thought and action, that it represents only very partially the general feeling of the clergy, and still less the general sentiment of the nation. Its pretensions, however, have grown to be not the less formidable, and it may be truly said that, alike in what it claims to do and not to do, it has become the chief obstacle to the harmonious working of the relations of Church and State. The refusal of the Oxford school in this its later stage to admit the authority of law in any form or shape—Parliament, Courts of Law, the voice of the collective Episcopate, the voice of the individual Bishop—is too extravagant to deserve a serious notice here, as is also the flippant and scurrilous vituperation of the episcopal order which has become the characteristic of their organs.

The restoration of Convocation leads us to consider another point in which Bishop Wilberforce took an active part, and which has tended materially to increase the strength of the movement in its second stage. In the earlier days of the Oxford school, not only had there been no Convocation, and very slight aspirations after it, but there had been none of those diocesan synods, Church congresses, and clerical conferences which have so largely characterised its later development. The whole movement of the 'Tracts for the 'Times' had been carried on without any such public display; and the beneficial influences which were showered on their dioceses by those earlier prelates whose names we have men-

tioned, existed quite irrespectively of any such machinery. This passion belongs, no doubt, to the same rage for public meetings and large assemblies which has prompted in general society the ever-multiplying associations and congresses, social or scientific, and which in the ecclesiastical world has appeared on the largest scale in the Œcumenical Council of the Vatican. In these assemblies Bishop Wilberforce was qualified, both by nature and by disposition, to take an active part. Nowhere was he so successful as in feeling the pulse and expressing the prejudices of a large clerical meeting; unless we except the wonderful geniality with which he would address the opposite, yet still in some respects similar, audience gathered after a public dinner. The missions and revivals which in all parts of the country have followed in the wake of the later Oxford school, have not been altogether peculiar to it. They belong in part to earlier manifestations of the same kind in Methodism, and in our own day they have been taken up by both sides of the Church; but it cannot be denied that they chiefly owe their existence to the second stage of the Oxford movement. In these Samuel Wilberforce was conspicuous for the same reasons that qualified him to rule synods or to address social gatherings; and as such he was naturally chosen as the leading figure at all ecclesiastical demonstrations.

Far be it from us to depreciate any efforts for the re-kindling of religious fervour. Yet it may be doubted whether these efforts can truly be reckoned amongst the better and more permanent manifestations of the religion of our time; and of such a mission, conducted on strictly ecclesiastical principles, and under the auspices of the Oxford clergy, it has been left on record by one who was himself amongst the most active of parish priests, and also a most zealous champion of the ecclesiastical aspect of the Church of England, that a parish which before the arrival of such a mission had seemed to be as the garden of Eden, was, by the strife and discord which this mission created, turned into a howling wilderness.*

Another sentiment which developed itself in the later Oxford school, but in which Bishop Wilberforce played only a secondary part, was the revival of what is called the ascetic spirit in the Church—the belief in a higher, more spiritual, more sacred existence apart from the conscientious performance of our duties to one another and to God. What is called the revival of the religious life has been often in fact the encouragement of daughters to desert their plain and obvious,

* Memorials of Dean Hook.

yet perhaps often irksome, duties at home, where they might be of much use to their parents and to their brothers and sisters, for the sake of some self-chosen occupation where often they can be of no use to anyone. Confession and absolution, with all its train of secret manuals, and sacramental pretensions, it is believed that he rather discountenanced than encouraged. But of this tendency, of which the earlier Oxford movement exhibited but very slight symptoms, we need not speak further; and Bishop Wilberforce, it is enough to say, was not by character or by circumstances induced to take any very active part in a system so alien to his own social, and we may almost say jovial, tendencies, although we must remark again, that as elsewhere so here he was put forward and put himself forward as the figure-head of these associations.

Such, on the whole, is the movement which began at Oxford in the year 1844, which came to a sudden termination in the year 1845, and which then revived under altered circumstances in the year 1850, and has continued with increasing zeal, and, we fear it must be said, also with increasing bitterness, down to the present time. Such also was the appearance of the most eminent leader whom this second stage may fairly claim as its own—its own, but with how large reserves! In the multiplied forms in which the genius of Bishop Wilberforce indulged, it is not for any single history to take account of all that he was or did. It has often been said that there were contained within him not only two but innumerable personalities. When we think of the tenderness, the grace, the quick wit, the lively jests, the unaffected sincerity and devotion which appear in his secret diaries now for the first time published, we cannot help admiring and almost loving the character in which such charms were combined. When we consider the total distrust which his policy inspired, the plottings, the intrigues, the vacillations, the tortuous ways and means by which he endeavoured to gain his ends, and when we think that to most of the ecclesiastical improvements which our time required his influence presented the most impracticable barrier, we cannot help regarding with considerable reservation any attempt to idolise his career as the ideal of a saintly prelate.

We return to the point from which we started. The Oxford school has narrowed its forces as it has advanced. It has obtained a stronger hold over the devotional feelings of the country, but at the cost of alienating an ever wider section of national sentiment. It has had its virtues, even its saints. It has had its follies and its vices. It will run on through its

successive stages of action and reaction. But if the English Church and the religion of England maintain their ground, it will at last be gradually absorbed in that larger, more generous movement from which it sprang, and which, in a great degree, it has thwarted. The backbone of British theology and religion is not there. It is, in a great degree, to be found in the rational and comprehensive faith, at once vigorous and Christian, which characterises the leading spirits of the Church of Scotland at this moment; Principal Caird, whose lectures we reviewed in our last number; Norman M'Leod, but lately removed too early from his Church and country; Principal Tulloch, whose work on the 'Rational Theology of England' is at once an example and a light to be followed. It is the higher genius which illuminates or has illuminated the pathway of English thought and practice;—the burning zeal of Frederick Maurice; the sermons of Frederick Robertson, more widely known than any others in the English language; the 'Catholic Thoughts,' too little read, of Frederick Myers, who anticipated in them almost all the problems which have since arisen; the fervent energy of Charles Kingsley, whose biography is read by thousands in all classes of the country, the massive and judicial mind of Bishop Thirlwall, the wider theology which adorned Oxford in the earlier period of the last fifty years and at Cambridge still abounds and flourishes. All these, honoured in many a manse and many a parsonage, by many a pastor whose voice is never heard in Convocation or Congress, but whose influence is not the less deep and powerful;—all these, multiplied by names which we do not quote because they are the names of living men, furnish a sufficient hope for a Biblical, Catholic, Liberal Christianity in the future which, if not baffled by the retrograde tendencies of the close of the nineteenth century, will be the prevailing and redeeming strength of the twentieth.

- ART. II.—1. *Papers respecting the Affairs of Egypt, presented to Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.* 1876–1880.
2. *Commission Supérieure d'Enquête.* Rapport préliminaire adressé à S.-A. le Khédive, Alexandrie: 1878.
3. *Ismâil Pasha Saddyk, ou la Mort du Moufettich.* Caire: 1879.
4. *First Report of the Commissioners of the Egyptian State Domains.* Cairo: 1880.

THERE is apparently no limit to the interest which Egypt can inspire in the rest of the world. Though she has a cultivated area no larger than that of Belgium, and though her population is less than that of Ireland, she is the observed of all political observers, and is an object of interest to all who can appreciate her past history, or estimate her present geographical importance. But it is not with an Egypt such as Sir Gardner Wilkinson wrote of, or even as Lane knew and described, that we now propose to deal. The Egypt of which we write is the Egypt of the dying Turkish rule; the Egypt where the fellah, so pulverised for centuries that it was thought he never could hope again, dares not only to hope but to feel that he is a being capable of participating in governments. Of the title he has thus to aspire, of the way in which he strives to conquer his destiny and to 'give the world assurance of a man,' something will be said in the course of this article. For the moment, it is enough to say that he is neither the perfect specimen of the downtrodden but long-suffering peasant, which some writers would make him out to be; nor is he the simple beast of burden, the mere hewer and drawer, as others say. He has this in common with subject races to whom great freedom is suddenly given, that for the most part he has no ambition to acquire riches. He prefers rather to enjoy the satisfaction of not being driven to work, and seeks to do little more than gain a bare subsistence till a bad Nile, or an epidemic, or a scarcity, sweeps him away. He has little or no sense of patriotism, and the principle of common and universal labour for the good of all—an important element in the cultivation of the artificially preserved land of Egypt—falls, in his case, on deaf ears. Our intention is to pass in review the main facts which have led to the establishment of the system of government which actually prevails there, and to review the course of that vast indebtedness which ended in

the International Commission of Liquidation in July of last year.

The existing system of government in Egypt had its origin in the organisation introduced by Mohammed Ali in 1805. The old system of things which had gone on with but few changes since Egypt, in 1517, lost its independence and became a Turkish Pashalik, was swept away by the French occupation in 1798. That old system of things was based upon the elementary principle of each one fighting for his own hand. If the ruler for the time being felt strong enough, he formally renounced allegiance to the Sultan at Constantinople, just as he was ready to apply humbly for the Sultan's aid against any local enemy who had grown too strong to be crushed without assistance. The Mameluke caste, founded on the same principle as the Janissary caste in Turkey proper, without family, without social tie or restraint, found no sufficient outlet for its restlessness in the ordinary wars of the country. Private wars of the bloodiest kind grew to be the order of the day, and combinations of Mamelukes pulled down one master to set up another, as the whim of the hour prompted. Though since the Turkish conquest the visible ruler had been always the Sultan's nominee, and was generally a stranger who had dearly bought the Pashalik at Constantinople, the Mamelukes were the virtual possessors of power, and for a century before Napoleon fought the Battle of the Pyramids they divided the provincial governments amongst themselves. Without their consent no law of general application was binding on the country. The arrangement, regarded as a governmental institution, was simple in the extreme. It suited, moreover, the general disposition of the Turkish Pasha, and realised, with a minimum of trouble to him, the object for which he had come to Egypt. The welfare of his subjects, the progress of industry, and the general development of the province were among the last ideas that ever entered his head. So long as he could live luxuriously and fare sumptuously every day, and recoup himself for the heavy outlay in bribes which had procured him his post, it was matter of utter indifference to him how many Egyptians perished under torture that his Mameluke nobility might live magnificently. But the principles of 1789 were fatal to simple governments of this sort in Egypt as elsewhere. The army of republican France tried conclusions with Mameluke feudalism at Sakhara and Metaireyeh, and fearful as the struggle was—at one time even doubtful—bruised its head, though it left the body alive. It was reserved for an

Oriental to accomplish, and in a purely Oriental manner, the work which the Frank had begun.

The three years of armed occupation by the French, and the four years from 1801 to 1805 which followed the surrender of the French garrisons to Sir Ralph Abercromby's army, were years of recruitment for the Mamelukes. Who but they could gather bands of troops together in force enough to make the French occupation a continual peril? Who but they were able to hem the French within the positions they held, and keep all Egypt, except the cities of Cairo and Alexandria, in one perpetual and harassing state of war against the invader and the infidel? They consolidated their power as against the common foe, reserving to themselves the right to quarrel amongst themselves later on. But they had no political head, no Pasha invested by the Padishah to rule over them, and they mistrusted, not without reason, those British Giaours to whom they had lent their swords in order to expel a yet more detested set of Franks. The British policy in Egypt at the beginning of the century was one which has commended itself again and again to earnest politicians of these latter days. The importance of the territory, at that time the *entrepôt* for so much of the trade of India, was seen as clearly then, as its importance as a highway to India is seen now. But though the desire was to maintain the footing the English had gained, and to govern the country like an Anglo-Indian province, no serious attempt was made, during the four years which followed the battles of Aboukir and Alexandria, to set up a prince who should rule in the British name.

That such a policy, could it have been carried out, would have been fraught with benefit to the oppressed subjects of Mameluke and Pasha, there is the precedent of India to show. But it was not to be; and the French, smarting under the military humiliations they had suffered in Egypt, succeeded, through astuteness in their diplomacy, in frustrating the English plan. It was mainly at their instance that when the Sultan, after seven years' interregnum in the Egyptian Pashalik, bethought him of nominating a *wali*, the choice fell, not on a mere favourite of the paying but *fainéant* kind, but on a Roumelian officer, whose character for firmness and ability had already become famous. This Roumelian officer was Mohammed Ali, a man of that rare kind of genius which impels its possessor to sustained acts of endurance and self-denial in order to acquire absolute power, and then leads him, albeit in an arbitrary manner, to use that power beneficently, and for the ulterior good of those under him. This man succeeded to the

tangle of confusion left by the two foreign occupations, and to the complications arising out of the undefined relations of the Mamelukes to their ruler. Upon him fell the task of reorganising *de novo* the internal administration of Egypt, and of settling, by wars, by negotiations, and by the power of his genius, the relation of the Padishah to his great vassal in Egypt. The principle striven for by Mohammed Ali in respect of the Sultan was the principle of suzerainty, as distinguished from that of sovereignty; the introduction of the hereditary principle in the Pashalik of Egypt, that guarantees might be afforded for the continuance in safe hands of a policy unfinished at the death of its projector. Mohammed Ali's principle of internal administration was that of treating Egypt as a whole, of breaking down all local power independent of the head of the State, and of founding what was probably meant for a benevolent despotism to which all local forces should converge, and by which they should be controlled.

Mohammed Ali's principles of internal administration must be followed in some detail if it be desired to have an understanding of the condition of Egypt to-day. It is evident that a policy which aimed at unifying Egypt, and of centralising authority there, must have foreseen the certainty of a conflict sooner or later with the caste which had governed directly or indirectly for nearly six centuries. A man of Mohammed Ali's sagacity must have calculated the chances, and have framed a plan that might at any minute be put in execution against these enemies. It is certain that when the time came for the inevitable explosion he was not found wanting in decision. He was at Suez, 115 miles from Cairo, in the last days of February 1811, when he heard of the Mameluke plot to seize the citadel at Cairo, to dethrone and destroy himself, and to restore the Mameluke rule. Most people probably have read of that famous ride across the desert on a dromedary; of his arrival at Cairo citadel several hours in advance of the time fixed for the outbreak; and of that superlative piece of treachery, if you will, by which four hundred and seventy-one of the leading Mamelukes were inveigled into the castle and then shot down without mercy. Of the desperate leap taken by Amin Bey, the one man who escaped and whose horse gave his life for his master's, all travellers to Cairo can testify, for they go religiously to see the spot.

Treacherous and sanguinary, according to Western ideas, as these proceedings were, the direct and immediate result of the massacre was the downfall of the one obstacle which stood between Mohammed Ali and the accomplishment of his admini-

strative policy. Not until the habitual takers with the sword had perished by the sword was it possible to organise the country on principles of regular administration. The provincial boundaries and the names of the provinces were maintained, but those who ruled in them knew them no more. Instead of the Mameluke satrap governing for his own account, the new and energetic policy of Mohammed placed in each province a Moudir who ruled with a sway almost as absolute as his predecessor's, but in the direct and personal interest of the Pasha of Egypt. Responsibility, though to the capricious will of a despot, took the place of complete irresponsibility in the relations between governor and peasant; and, though the condition of the fellah was not immediately changed for the better, there were instances in which rough justice was done as between the oppressor and the oppressed, when chance or importunity brought the facts to the knowledge of the Pasha.

But the theory which underlay the fundamental principle of government—viz. that Egypt and the Egyptians, having been conquered by the Turks, existed henceforth by the Turkish permission and for the Turkish advantage—was by no means given up. Far from it. When in 1840 Mohammed Ali, obliged, by the armed intervention of England, Russia, and Austria, to renounce his projects of conquest and his designs upon Constantinople, found himself with a large surplus army on his hands, he decided to distribute his men as military colonists throughout the country. The principle of land tenure then in force—that all the soil of Egypt belonged of right to the Pasha, and that occupiers, no matter how great the consideration paid for the occupancy, were but tenants at will—lent itself easily to this policy. Individual occupiers inimical to the Pasha were dispossessed, and the land was portioned among his adherents. The sagacity of Mohammed enabled him to derive a double benefit from the distribution. With a hundred acres of good land he would give a hundred acres that had not yet been brought into cultivation. He made the cultivation of the second hundred an essential condition of the grant, and he took care, by constant and often by personal inspection, to ensure that the conditions were fulfilled. By means of grants of the same nature, but on a larger scale, he established, primarily for the benefit of his own family, the property known as a 'chefalik,' which may best be likened to an English manor in feudal times. The visible head of the 'chefalik' was some great officer or Bey, who settled down on the land as the Wekil or deputy of the Pasha's kinsman, and proceeded to employ his former soldiers as foremen and directors

of labour, cultivating the old and the new lands for the owner's benefit. Each settler had a certain number of acres assigned to him, to attach him to the place and the better to enable him to dominate the fellah, who constituted the labour fund for proprietor and overseers alike. Just as the Bey naturally did not give in grant to his old soldiers the best of the land, so the soldier colonists gave to the fellah who came to settle on the *demesne* only such land as they despaired of themselves. But to the wandering peasant, turned out of his village by strangers or driven by want of scope to find a living elsewhere, even the poorest land was something. Accustomed to hard toil, he despaired of no ground to which water could be led. He saw his way to earn a living, albeit a scanty one, in conditions which allowed of his working for himself when not engaged in serf's work on the great proprietors' land, and which assured to him, in exchange for a full surrender of his personal liberty, protection from the vexations and exactions of publicans and the rest of the governmental tribe. These *adscripti glebæ* became the copyholders of the manor, and in time received a small wage in addition to their plot of land; but they were not free to go away, and they owed all their labour to their lord who protected them. By these means considerable tracts of land which before had been uncultivated were made to yield crops; and the Government, to encourage the process, laid but a light tax on the new lands while deriving a full land-revenue from the others. It is needless to say that powerful persons, having lands of the two categories, were enabled to schedule their lands rather freely as 'ouchoury' or low-tax lands, though in truth they should have passed for 'kharaghi' or lands liable to full rent.

Land in Egypt is, at the present time, divided into two classes—Government lands and lands in private ownership. The former are greatly in the majority, and are let on a lease under which the full price of the usufruct is taken. But this price is a fixed one, varying in amount according to the value of the land as assessed by a jury of the province from time to time. The right of the tenant to transmit, give, sell, or sublet the land—in short, to act as the proprietor, subject to the payment of his fixed kharag—is complete. This right is acquired by a prescription of five years, and it is forfeited by non-claim during the like period. It is lost also by non-payment of rent, or by the inability of the tenant to cultivate the ground. The State in this case resumes possession.

Private landed estates, in the English sense of the word, were formerly unknown, but since Mohammed Ali's time they have

been recognised. They comprise the 'chefaliks,' already described; 'abadieh' lands, or lands granted in return for public services and resembling chefaliks in their internal economy; and 'ohdeh' lands. These last were constituted in cases where villages, loaded with arrears of taxes, and unable to pay their kharag or rent, agreed with persons who would discharge their debts to surrender part of their land, and to assist their new and doubtful friend in the cultivation of his acquisition. The late Khedive acquired large tracts of ground in this way, and, to make the people more disposed to accept his terms, absolved them from the *corvée*. But this kind of holding has been suppressed, and the villages have returned under the authority of the Moudir of the province. The 'chefaliks' and 'abadiehs'—though some of the finest land is to be found in them—pay 'ochoor,' or tithe, by way of tax; the rest of the country pays the fixed kharag.

Whilst taking special pains to extend the cultivated area of his country, and to centralise authority, Mohammed Ali never forgot the duties which belong to the man who rules despotically. He was unsparing of himself and of his family, in discharging the obligations of personal government. In order that the paramount duty of clearing the canals and of regulating the irrigation works, which are the life of Egypt, should not be neglected, the Pasha divided all Egypt into four districts, taking to himself the most difficult, and giving one of the others to each of his sons. Example and the power of the ruler visible on the spot, made it impossible for any man, no matter what his rank, to escape from the duty of contributing in person or in money to the one work absolutely necessary for the whole country. Canals were cleaned out, the dykes were kept, and fresh enterprises in irrigation were begun, such as have not been seen in Egypt since Mohammed Ali's day. Not only were public works successfully executed, but the whole business of administration was carried out at a cost which contrasts strangely with the finances exhibited by the Commission of Inquiry into the affairs of Mohammed Ali's grandson, Ismail Pasha.

The debt which Mohammed Ali had contracted during his war against the Sultan, and in his Syrian campaigns, was wiped out before his death, and yet large sums of money were necessary for the numerous reforms which this vigorous administrator introduced. The Pasha was everything. It was his will that the army should be new-modelled, and it was his genius which introduced for that purpose Europeans like the French sergeant, Suleiman Pasha, who brought the knowledge

he required, but remained in every sense his servant. His the skill to entice the foreign engineer, the foreign road-maker, the foreign administrator and organiser, and to keep them devoted, but subordinate. His public schools still survive, and his efforts to reform the courts of justice only just failed of success. What he might still have achieved had not his reason become clouded in his later years it is useless to speculate; but his great powers of mind and body were spent from first to last in the improvement of the country, and indirectly in the improvement of the people whom nevertheless he ruled with an absolutism equal to that of Haroun e' Raschid. Mohammed Ali was the wise tyrant required for the translation of Egypt from Mamelukism to a centralised despotism; and if severity, even cruelty, characterised his rule, it must always be remembered with what materials he had to work, and the deep-rooted corruptions and abuses with which he had to deal.

But it is the bane of all despotisms, however well-meaning, that there can be no guarantee for the good intentions or good behaviour of the despot who may succeed the benevolent or the wise. Mohammed Ali died in 1849, and was followed by his grandson Abbas, who, with the same authority as his predecessor, was in every respect his opposite in character. During his five years' reign Egypt slipped back into many of the old bad ways, and the extortioner and the wrongdoer went to work with all the force of the Prince's example, and with appetites whetted by years of fasting. It is doubtful whether under his successor Saïd Pasha—the passive promoter of railways, of the Suez Canal, and of other works of public utility which had a European initiative—the condition of the Egyptian peasant was much bettered. Indirectly, perhaps, he profited by the advantages which these works brought to the country generally: though even this is doubtful. What is not doubtful, however, is that his serfdom remained, that he was still the hewer of wood and drawer of water he had been before, and that the decline of personal vigilance in the central despot had left him so subject to local tyrannies that it is questionable if he was better off than his forefathers under the Mamelukes.

By the time Ismaïl Pasha ascended the throne in 1863—through an accident which many living contemporaries call by another name, but which caused the heir presumptive and several of his near kinsmen to be drowned at Kaffr Zayat—Egypt presented the spectacle of a country already deeply penetrated with European influences, but devoid of all national life. Railways, steam pumps, the most modern cotton-cleaning machinery, iron bridges, rice mills, telegraphs, and

postal services, all were there—but for the benefit of the ruler only, and of those whose interest lay in supporting him. It might be said that the slavery of the ‘fellah’ was intensified by all these things. The railways took away all the sooner the results of his toil, and gave occasion to the exactor of labour to require fresh work from him. They took away, moreover, the produce on which the ‘fellah’ had subsisted, so that he had to pay more for the food he wished to retain on the spot. The peasant in the ‘chefalik,’ with his acre of land and his participation in the general prosperity of his master, was happier than the unattached ‘villein,’ whose day wages remained stationary in the presence of rising prices. Anyhow the personal authority of the Pasha over all his subjects—an authority reflected through a long series of greedy officials armed with unlimited power of the bastinado, and in many cases with the power of life and death—remained intact, and it was exercised with extravagant severity. Never was the maxim of the Roman law—that a prisoner of war owed all to the captor who had spared to slay him, and was therefore to him a perpetual bondsman—more exemplified in practice, and in all its hardness, than in Egypt, at the time when the civilisation of the West seemed to have taken root in the country. Let the story of Ismaïl Pasha bear witness. There is neither time nor space to write here the detailed history of that Viceroy’s reign. We must summarise after the fashion of the *Chronicles of the Kings of Israel and of Judah*, and say the history of Ismaïl and all that he did, the harbour works that he constructed, the sugar factories that he erected, the numberless palaces that he built, the armies that he equipped, the fleets that he bought, and the vast sums of money that he squandered, are they not written in the books of his enemies like the author of ‘*La Mort du Mou-fettich*,’ of his apologists like Mr. M’Coan, in the suffering memory of his former subjects, and in the reports of the Commission d’Enquête and of the Commission of Liquidation?

When Saïd Pasha died in 1863, the public debt of Egypt stood at 3,000,000*l.* When Ismaïl Pasha abdicated in 1879, the public debt stood at 105,184,380*l.*, and represented an expenditure at the rate of 6,574,000*l.* a year over and above the regular annual income of the country, and over and above that irregular annual income which was derived from exaction, proceeding from the mere will and pleasure of the Khedive’s aiders and abettors in oppression. The ingenuity and perseverance of the Commission of Inquiry were spent in vain when they tried to fathom the extent of the irregular income of

the Viceroy. This might well be when we find on p. 21 of the report of this Commission the statement following :—

‘Savoir en vertu de quelle loi un impôt est perçu est, du reste, la dernière préoccupation du fonctionnaire chargé de le percevoir, comme du contribuable astreint à le payer.

‘Le cheik exécute les ordres du moudir, et le moudir ceux de l’Inspecteur Général, qui lui-même agit par *ordre supérieur*. Cet ordre supérieur, c’est la loi. Les agents du gouvernement s’y conforment, fût-il verbal, et il ne vient à l’esprit des contribuables ni d’en contester l’existence ni de protester contre sa teneur. “Pour les impôts, le fellah ne peut se plaindre,” nous a dit l’inspecteur général de la Haute-Egypte; “il sait qu’on agit par *ordre supérieur*. C’est le gouvernement lui-même qui les réclame; à qui voulez-vous qu’il se “plaigne?”’

Referring readers to the various works on the actual history of Ismaïl Pasha’s reign, some of which are included in the list of books at the head of this article, we propose to review somewhat closely the financial events of the last years of his reign, especially those which preceded his downfall, and led to the direct interference of the European Powers in the internal affairs of the country.

Till the year 1876 the Khedive may be said to have been allowed to flounder by himself in the great bog of debt. During the thirteen years he had reigned, he had indulged in every kind of extravagance which an unscrupulous Oriental tainted with the vices of the West could imagine. He had been helped in this course by many who carry their heads very high in Europe now, who battered on his fat pastures, and then denounced him. These apostles of respectability—who only discovered the bad character of their pupil when he suspended the payment of usurious coupons, or stopped from sheer exhaustion the flow of money, under contracts which at home would have been declared scandalous—were knocking daily at Ministers’ doors in Paris and London, in the year 1876, urging those Governments to intervene actively in their behalf. Up to that time the English Government had followed consistently the line of non-interference officially in the internal affairs of Egypt. It had been not indifferent to the appeals made to it from time to time by the Egyptian Government for administrative assistance. Requests for competent organisers of Ministries of Commerce, of Custom Houses, of the Post Office, and of the Marine had been passed on by the Foreign Office to those departments of English Government which seemed most likely to furnish volunteers. It was no fault of the British

Government if men of position, or those who hoped to attain one, in the service of their own country, were not tempted to Egypt by the conditions offered. The English Government refused to take upon itself any responsibility of nomination, either as regards the Khedive or the English official who might enter his service; so that the Englishmen who went to Egypt were either pensioners whose services had been dispensed with at home, or aspirants who saw no way to making a career in the Queen's service. The natural result was that with the brilliant exception of the gentleman whom the Egyptians were so lucky as to get to take charge of their Post Office, and who now presides over their Customs, the English administrative missionaries in Egypt were more or less failures, and the fact of their failure recoiled injuriously upon the English influence in the country.

In 1876, the Khedive, with a funded debt of no more than 8,000,000*L.*, was head over ears in financial difficulties. His creditors for a sum which, with interest, stood at something like 90,000,000*L.*, were clamorous for a settlement. So long as they thought they saw their way to another piastre of plunder they kept the bailiffs in leash, and consented to renew bills at accommodation prices, ranging from 12 per cent., the legal rate of interest, to 40 per cent. But as soon as it was clear the game could go on no longer, they hastened to put their bonds in suit, and to bring all the pressure they could command upon the Western Governments to intervene in their behalf. The French Government, more under the influence of the financial world than our own, listened to the application, and strove to induce the British Government to concert measures for securing the creditors. But these advances were not encouraged; the policy of abstention from interference in the domestic affairs of Egypt was maintained; and the creditors, left to the ordinary channels for redress, continued to issue their citations, and to make life hateful to their great debtor.

Ismail Pasha had seen the storm brewing, and, as early as October 1875, considered how he was to provide himself a shelter. Perfectly aware of the disinclination of England to intervene officially, resenting the semi-official diplomatic interference which the French Government had begun, and hoping to engage in some way or other the responsibility of the British Government in his affairs, he told General Stanton, her Majesty's Agent and Consul-General, that he was very desirous of securing the services of some 'competent Government official, thoroughly acquainted with the system followed in her Majesty's Treasury, to assist the Minister of

‘Finance in remedying the confusion which his Highness admitted existed in that department of his administration.’

General Stanton having obtained from Nubar Pasha, then Minister for Foreign Affairs, a written statement of what was wanted, forwarded to the Foreign Office a demand for the services of two gentlemen who should superintend, under the Minister of Finance, the receipts and expenditure of the Egyptian Treasury. These gentlemen, ‘or at least one of them,’ were not only to be capable of reorganising the Treasury, but to be ‘conversant with those studies of political economy which, in modern times, have demonstrated the true principles which govern the development of the resources of a country.’

The British Government, at the end of November 1875, pointed out that ‘the information afforded by General Stanton in his despatch, as to the actual condition of Egyptian Finance, and as to the powers proposed to be given to the gentlemen to be nominated by her Majesty’s Government, is so general in its terms, that it would seem to be impossible’ to comply with the request preferred, and proposed ‘that a gentleman in the confidence of her Majesty’s Government, of financial and administrative capacity, should be sent out to confer with the Khedive and his Government, as to the financial position and administration of Egypt, in order that, on his report, her Majesty’s Government may be placed in a position to give the assistance which is requested from them.’

On November 30, 1875, the Khedive ‘appeared gratified at the announcement’ that Mr. Stephen Cave, M.P., her Majesty’s Paymaster-General, would come out on this special mission; whilst on their side the British Government told Mr. Cave they did not doubt that the Khedive would ‘treat him with perfect frankness, and afford every facility for ascertaining correctly the position of the financial affairs of Egypt.’ In conveying his instructions to General Stanton, Lord Derby said ‘her Majesty’s Government especially wish that it should be understood that this special mission must not be taken to imply any desire to interfere with the internal affairs of Egypt, but is of a purely friendly character, dictated by the interest which this country has always taken in the welfare and prosperity of Egypt.’ It was precisely this quasi-official attitude, unaccompanied by any responsible act or offer of assistance, which ultimately so irritated the Khedive; at the same time that it roused the susceptibility of the French Government. At the very time when, in February

1876, Mr. Cave was taking leave of the Khedive, and was being made acquainted with an error His Highness 'had recently 'discovered in his calculations affecting the land-tax'—an error which was to make an ultimate difference to the Egyptian Treasury of 2,500,000*l.*—the Duc Decazes was expressing to Lord Lyons his conviction that the only way of guarding the great interests of the English and French creditors would 'be found in a close understanding between the 'English and French Governments, and a determination on 'their part to take the matter resolutely in hand,' and was deprecating anything like rivalry between the two Governments on the question. It was known that Mr. Cave's report had been drawn up, if not presented, and the gist of that report was an open secret. The French Government not unnaturally supposed that some governmental act would follow the report; and it was already known that the British Government had so far at all events decided on certain steps, that it had determined to send Mr. Rivers Wilson to assist in reorganising the Treasury, in accordance with the Khedive's request. Indeed, in answer to the Duc Decazes' observations, Lord Derby adduced this latter fact as one reason for not undertaking any joint action. He reciprocated the desire for the most friendly relations between the two Governments in regard to Egyptian financial matters; had no reason to suppose that the Khedive desired the establishment of any system of control over his finances by foreign Governments; and added that her Majesty's Government, whilst deprecating, equally with the Duc Decazes, 'any idea of international rivalry in such a matter, at the same 'time do not see that this rivalry, of which her Majesty's 'Government had never entertained a notion, would be obviated, even in appearance, by an attempt to place the 'revenues of Egypt under an International Commission.'

It is not remarkable that the Duc Decazes, seeing that as yet the English Government had alone been applied to for help by the Khedive—that no less a person than one of her Majesty's Ministers had been sent out on a special and searching financial inquiry to Egypt, and that one of the best heads in the English Treasury was about to start on a mission of detailed reorganisation—should have read the last of Lord Derby's words, just quoted, in a sense different from that their author intended. He seemed to see an intention on the part of the British Government to have no International Commission in Egypt for the reason that that Government intended to establish an exclusively English control over the finances there. On the other hand, he was pressed by the large and in-

fluent body of French creditors to intervene in their behalf, and especially to give Government sanction to a proposal which had been subscribed by Ismaïl Pasha Saddyk, the Khedive's Minister of Finance, and the Anglo-Egyptian Banking Company, for the formation of a National Bank which should, among other things, farm all the revenues of Egypt, and ensure the payment and amortissement of the funded and floating debts.

This proposal was simultaneous with the close of Mr. Cave's work. Mr. Cave took leave of the Khedive on February 19, and the draft agreement between the Finance Minister and the Anglo-Egyptian Banking Company was dated a week earlier. It is doubtful how far the Khedive foresaw the refusal of England to help him. He may have thought to force her hand by consenting to the charter of the National Bank, of which one of the features was to be the appointment of commissioners by England, France, and Italy, to make sure that the engagements undertaken on behalf of the creditors were faithfully executed. France and Italy consenting to nominate, he may have hoped to compel the British Government to follow suit. This tricky sort of policy, besides being natural to him, was in keeping with the error 'he had recently discovered in his calculations affecting the 'land-tax,' and with the false statements of figures and the material suppression of facts which it was afterwards found had been the rule in the dealings of his Government with Mr. Cave's mission.

It is time, however, to notice the report of that mission. Much adverse criticism has been made and some derision has been cast upon the contents of this report by those who afterwards had fuller means of gauging the truth of the statements of Egyptian officials, and by that more numerous class of persons who are wise after the event. But considering the enormous difficulty which exists even now in arriving at a correct statement of facts in Egypt, penetrated though it has become since 1875 with the European spirit and method, there is little room for wonder that a gentleman to whom her Majesty's Government said they doubted not the Khedive would 'treat him with perfect frankness and afford every 'facility for ascertaining correctly the position of the financial 'affairs of Egypt' should have been led into error by those frank persons to whom he was accredited. But one hesitates to impute bad faith to the Khedive in the matter. Those who know best what his relations were to the Moufettich, or Minister of Finance, will not reject the theory that there might possibly have been good faith in the Khedive, and that

the false returns of income and expenditure derived their origin from the orders of the Minister, of whom more anon. Enough here to say that the Minister could not disclose all he knew, and remain either in office or in Egypt.

Mr. Cave's report opens with three pages of matter intended to convey information as to the tenure of land, the sources of revenue, and the position of the new industry—e.g. sugar growing—in Egypt. There are not a few trite sayings in these three pages, and the information is of the meagre kind which might have been looked for in the note-book of an ordinary Nile tourist. But the other eight pages show signs of considerable labour; and if capital figures are wrong through the deceitfulness of the wily Arab, 'in whose office,' Mr. Cave tells us, 'no European is at present employed or even allowed 'to enter,' the marshalling of the facts and the general recommendations of the Commissioner fairly entitle the report to the praise which her Majesty's Government bestowed upon it.

Though the value of the report dwindles into nothing by the side of the reports of the Commission Supérieure d'Enquête, the reports of the Commissioners of the Public Debt, and of the several Europeanised administrations which have since been founded, we may glean some interesting facts from it, and we must always remember that of necessity its contents were scanty and untrustworthy.

The revenue of Egypt in 1804 is put down at 55,000*l.*—a seemingly impossible figure—at 3,300,000*l.* in 1830, 4,937,405*l.* in 1864, and 7,377,912*l.* in 1871. In 1874 was passed the law of Moukabalah, of which we have heard so much and understood so little. It was a decree issued by the Khedive, on the advice of Nubar Pasha, and allowed the perpetual redemption of half the land-tax to all those who paid down a sum equal to six years' tax. The object was to acquire at once a sum sufficient to pay off the floating debt of that date. It was a spendthrift's device to get ready money; and as in the case of the involved youth whom Mr. Melter Moss is to help out of pressing difficulties by the loan of 100*l.*, the borrower has to take 20 per cent. in cigars and pictures, so, in the case of Egypt, the six years' purchase was not only a ruinous price to pay for the accommodation, but, by allowing long deferred payments of part of the capital, even that price was spoiled and the object of the measure was marred. It is perhaps needless to say that the 13,000,000*l.* which was paid first and last, on account of the Moukabalah, did not go in liquidation of the floating debt. The plan of Nubar Pasha to throw off by one great effort the choking grip of the unsecured creditors,

was frustrated by the fact that he had no sort of power over the money when once it had reached the Treasury. As a matter of fact, only enough of the Moukabalah money was paid to those creditors to keep some of them quiet for a time, and to allow of bills being renewed. The rest went to defray the enormous current charges which the Minister of Finance had to provide for.

Here is Mr. Cave's account of the various loans existing in 1875:—

'In 1862 Saïd Pasha contracted the first loan. The nominal amount was 3,292,800*l.*, repayable in thirty years; the interest 7 per cent., and the sinking fund 1 per cent. We have no particulars of the amount really received on this loan.

'In 1864 the first of the present Viccroy's loans was contracted. The nominal amount was 5,704,200*l.*, of which, however, only 4,864,063*l.* was received. The interest and sinking fund on the nominal amount were respectively 7 and 3·87 per cent.; but on the amount received they were 8·2 and 4·5, or, together, 12·7 per cent., instead of 10·87 per cent., on the nominal value. This loan was redeemable in fifteen years, and will, therefore, be paid off in 1879.

'The loan of 1868 was not made redeemable till 1898; its nominal amount was for 11,890,000*l.*, of which only 7,193,334*l.* was received. The apparent interest and sinking fund of 7 and 1 per cent. became, therefore, 11·56 and 1·68 per cent., or, together, 13½ per cent.

'In 1873 a further loan was contracted for a nominal amount of 32,000,000*l.*, at 7 per cent. interest and 1 per cent. sinking fund, but as only 20,062,658*l.* was even nominally received, these figures became 11·0 and 1·62 per cent., and the charge, 12·62 per cent.; but of this 20,062,658*l.*, at least 9,000,000*l.* were paid into the Treasury in bonds of the floating debt taken at 93 per cent. The Treasury may therefore be held to have received 20,740,077*l.*, and the annual charge amounts to only 12·3 per cent. on this sum.

'A loan was raised for the construction of railways in 1866. Its nominal amount was 3,000,000*l.*, at 7 per cent. The amount received by the State was 2,640,000*l.*, which raised the interest to 8 per cent. The full amount of 3,000,000*l.* was repaid by six annual instalments of 500,000*l.* each, from January 1, 1869, to January 1, 1874—a rate equivalent to a sinking fund of 18·9 per cent.; so that during six years this loan entailed on the State an average charge equal to 26·9 per cent. of the amount realised.

'In addition to these regular State loans there are two Daira loans, which have been transferred to the State against value received. These are:—

'The Anglo-Egyptian Loan of 1865 for 3,000,000*l.*, at 9 per cent. interest and sinking fund of 3·27 per cent., in all, 12·27 per cent.; and the Mustapha Pasha Loan of 1867 for 2,080,000*l.*, which was raised at 9 per cent., with a sinking fund of 3·4 per cent., in all, 12·4 per cent. Both of these loans will have been repaid by the end of 1881.

'The personal loan of the Khedive, raised on his private estates in 1870, was obtained on slightly more onerous terms than the State loans, excepting that for railways. To obtain 5,000,000*l.*, his Highness engaged to pay back 7,142,860*l.* in twenty years, with 7 per cent. interest on this nominal amount. So that he really pays on the amount received 10 per cent. interest and 3·36 per cent. sinking fund, or a yearly charge of 13·36 per cent.'

But Mr. Cave could not tell—for who even now knows all?—what was the secret history of these loans, and of the contracts for works and supplies from Europe which contributed so largely to make the loans necessary. The open history of the 1873 loan is a scandal in itself, but the secret history of that and of its predecessors is discouraging enough to those who think that Western civilisation and influence can benefit the East. The 1873 loan was for a nominal amount of 32,000,000*l.*, and was meant to pay the floating debt, which then stood at 28,000,000*l.* Notwithstanding the utter discredit in which Egypt stood, it was brought out at 93 because the conditions enabled the contractors to make a family party arrangement of at least one half of it—the public might do what they liked as to the rest. Out of the nominal sum of 32,000,000*l.*, bearing 7 per cent. interest, and with 1 per cent. for the sinking fund, no more than 20,740,077*l.* got credited to the Treasury. But of this amount, 9,000,000*l.* was allowed to be paid in bonds of the floating debt. These bonds were freely bought up by the contractors, at prices which went as low as 65 per cent., and were paid into the Treasury at 93.

Here is a piece of secret history, not to be found in Mr. Cave's or any other report, which will serve to show the way in which the floating debt was filled up, the way in which the Khedive broke faith with the public, and how he was helped in his wrong doings by Europeans who now are of great standing. It was promised in 1868, when the loan of that date was brought out, that no fresh loan should be put forward for at least five years. But in 1870–71 there came the customary pinch at the palace and the Treasury, and the arch truster in to-morrow cast about for a remedy. There was a certain man who had made money in the Crimean War, who had subsequently settled in Egypt and had ingratiated himself with the Khedive. This obliging person was at hand when Ismail Pasha wanted to know whether he happened to have such a thing as 2,000,000*l.* about him. It was a large sum, more than half the public debt of Egypt at the time of Ismail's accession; and the public, moreover, must know nothing about it. Besides, it would be repaid in two years' time, when clearly

it would be lawful, and in accordance with the engagement, to draw afresh on the gullibility and greediness of the Western peoples. So the obliging lender called his family around him, and allotted them shares in this private loan with interest at 16 per cent., and with a security which proved to be valid when the 1873 loan came to be dribbled away.

Mr. Cave finished his report by stating that every branch of revenue was already mortgaged; that in his opinion the resources of Egypt, if properly managed, were enough to meet her liabilities, but that 'she cannot go on renewing floating debts at 25 per cent., and raising fresh loans at 12 or 13 per cent. interest, to meet those additions to her debt which do not bring in a single piastre to her Exchequer.' He recommended the purchase, for the purpose of consolidation, of the loans of 1868 and 1873, and of the bonds of the floating debt, so as to release securities which might be available as guarantees for the new stock to be issued at a reasonable price and to bear a moderate interest. He further recommended the establishment of a central office under the management of an experienced official, to be sent out from England, who should see that receipts and disbursements were rightly imputed in the accounts.

Now Ismaïl Pasha cared very little about the reorganisation of his Government offices. Quite in a general way he liked to be thought *en rapport* with Western ideas on such subjects; but the last thing he wished was to upset a system which enabled him to have from his pliant and well-behaved Moufettich, who did not ask questions, or plague him for accounts, as much money as he needed for his personal use. What he wanted urgently in March 1876 was the means of paying or of temporising with his creditors, and, as the former desideratum was unattainable, he bent all his efforts towards the achievement of the second. In this he was supported by the French and Italian Governments, who not only approved of the National Bank scheme, but agreed to nominate their commissioners. The French Government, in addition, not to be outdone in friendliness by the English, ordered M. Villet, Inspector-General of Finance, to go to Cairo—a request to that effect having come from the Khedive—in order to assist in the work of reorganising the Treasury there. Mr. Rivers Wilson reached Cairo on March 16, and M. Villet left France on March 15 to join in this good work.

On March 23 the Duc Decazes told Lord Lyons plainly that he wished above all things to be in complete accord with the British Government, and that he earnestly hoped an Eng-

lish commissioner would be named, if not for the proposed National Bank, then for an international commission of the public debt; but that he could not, in the interest of the numerous French holders of Egyptian bonds, allow Egypt to become bankrupt, and that, to avoid this, he must speedily, in conjunction with Italy, nominate commissioners. Negotiations went on during March, April, and May. The French Foreign Office continued to urge the nomination of a commissioner; the British agent in Cairo wrote that in official circles there it was considered the adhesion of the British Government would save the situation; the English merchants in Alexandria petitioned for intervention; the Council of Foreign Bondholders, and finally Messrs. Frühling and Goschen, asked for assistance in behalf of the interests they represented. Lord Derby declared that in no case would he consent to nominate a commissioner without knowing beforehand the details of the plan of liquidation, and that her Majesty's Government 'will not enter into any arrangement unless they are first satisfied that the scheme involves no injustice to creditors, that it will not throw too heavy a burden on the finances of Egypt, and that it has in it the element of financial success, supposing it to be honestly worked.'

The Government persisted in its refusal to intervene; and when asked by the Khedive if it would oppose the nomination of Mr. Rivers Wilson as commissioner of the public debt, said it would neither oppose nor approve, but that it would not extend Mr. Wilson's leave of absence from the English service. To this day the English commissioner of the public debt is the only unofficially appointed member of that body. At the instance of the Khedive Mr. Goschen, acting as *amicus curiæ*, nominated Captain Baring, and he has nominated successively Mr. Auckland Colvin and Mr. Money to the post on vacancies occurring though promotion.

The scheme for the National Bank fell through, as did another plan presented by a French syndicate for converting the debt, but on May 7 a decree appeared approving of a plan of conversion drawn up on much the same lines as its predecessor. At the same time appeared the decree for the establishment of the Caisse de la Dette. The new scheme suspended the operation of the Moukabalah, reserving certain rights, more or less illusory, to those who had paid their quota under it; it put down the consolidated debts of the State and of the Daira (or private estate of the Khedive) at 91,000,000*l.*; stated the sum required for interest and sinking fund at 6,443,600*l.* a year; and set aside the revenues of four provinces,

of the customs, of the railways, the *octroi* duties, the salt and tobacco taxes, and the Nile dues, for the payment of this sum. The revenues described in the list were to be paid into the Caisse of the public debt, and their redistribution thus guaranteed.

This mixing up of loans, contracted under very varying conditions, the onerous terms of the conversion, and above all the throwing in of the obligations of the Khedive's Daira, which had in no way come under State control, drew forth a storm of protests and reclamations. The British Government refused to countenance the plan, or to have anything to do with the management of it; but it made no opposition to the selection by the Khedive's representatives of English officials who chose to enter the Egyptian service. Mr. Romaine, who had been Secretary of the Admiralty, and General Marriott, who had served many years in India, and Mr. Malan from the Board of Trade, went to Egypt to fill the posts for which they had been chosen by the Khedive's advisers. But these gentlemen went without any guarantee or responsibility on the part of the British Government. The Khedive went on with his scheme; invented a supreme Treasury Council which was admirably constituted to appear to be solid, and to be in fact useless. To this institution the British Government equally refused to nominate a commissioner.

English bondholders of Egyptian stocks, finding that they must look after their own interests, and that the Government would do little more for them than for the bondholders of Honduras, Peruvian, Spanish, Venezuelan, and other crazy funds, asked Mr. Goschen to represent their interests, and to try to get more equitable terms than were offered by the decree of May 7.

On October 12 Mr. Goschen, accompanied by M. Joubert, who represented the French group of protestants against the May decree, arrived in Egypt, and on November 3 the 'Times' published the following telegram:—

* Cairo : November 3, 1876.

'EGYPTIAN FINANCE.—The proposals made in the financial plan which Mr. Goschen presented to the Khedive yesterday are in substance as follows:—

'Mr. Goschen proposes the withdrawal of the whole of the Daira Debt from the Unified Debt, and the application of the Moukabalah revenue to the redemption of the short loans, as proposed in Mr. Cave's report, but at the rate of 80 instead of 100. He would reduce the bonus on Treasury bonds to 10 per cent., and proposes the issue of 15,000,000*l.* sterling of 5 per cent. preference stock, guaranteed on the railways, placing the latter under separate European administration. This preference stock to be offered in exchange for 1862, 1868, and

1873 stock. The above measures would reduce the Unified Debt to 59,000,000*l*. The Egyptian Government would continue paying on the latter 7 per cent interest, whereof the holders would receive 6 per cent., the remainder going to the balance of the Moukabalah revenue, and being applied to the reduction of the Unified Debt by half-yearly open market purchases, the sinking fund being managed by the International Financial Commission. Full interest to creditors would be resumed with the extinction of the Moukabalah in 1886. The reduction of the debt would be effected meanwhile by a sinking fund, and would more than compensate for the deficiency in the revenue through the extinction of the Moukabalah tax. Additional securities are demanded for the proper working of the International Financial Commission, including the addition of a representative of English interests. Mr. Goschen's plan further demands the appointment of English and French Comptrollers-General, the former being charged with the collection of the revenue, and the latter with the general audit and the supervision of all agreements affecting the public debt. Both comptrollers would hold authority direct from the Khedive.'

This proposal having been adopted by Viceregal decree on November 18, arrangements were at once made for executing the various administrative changes contemplated in the measure. The railways on which the preference stock was secured were handed over to European administrators with an Egyptian colleague; the control over accounts was ordered to be placed in the hands of Mr. Romaine and M. de Malaret; and the Customs were put under an English director. The commissioners of the public debt, on the very day on which the above-named officials were taking up their appointments, issued a formal protest to the effect that the engagements entered into by the Government for the encashment of the affected revenues had been and still were systematically broken by the Minister of Finance, who admitted that he had diverted, to meet pressing obligations, large sums which by rights should have been paid into the Caisse. On November 4, Mr. Vivian reported that 4,000,000*l*. of the revenue anticipated by the budget remained unpaid.

Ismail Pasha, tortured by the *exposé* caused by this continuous inquest-making into his affairs, afraid of what might happen if further enquiries should be pressed, and irritated at the practical result of twelve months of ceaseless negotiation and intrigue, determined on what Mr. Vivian described as 'one of those dramatic incidents peculiar to Eastern life and history.' Within a week after the issue of the protest of the Commissioner of the Caisse, he arrested his Finance Minister, known as 'the Moufettich,' and caused him to be tried during the night by the Council of Ministers, on a charge of 'fostering agita-

'tion in the provinces, and conspiring against the Viceroy, 'whom he had accused of being responsible for all the financial 'miseries of Egypt, and of plundering the country in concert 'with Europeans.' This singular person, who, from having been a farm servant, rose in a few years to be master of a fortune which allowed of an expenditure rivalling that of his master, who inspired throughout Egypt a terror which clings even to his memory, was cast in a day from the height of supreme power to the condition of an exile for life to the White Nile. He never reached his destination. Two days after he left Cairo under close arrest, came the news of his death on the way. Information such as he possessed, secrets shared by him with the Khedive only, must never have the chance of being imparted. Dead lips can make no defence. Upon the scapegoat shall be heaped all the blame of the solemn farce, called broken faith, which had been played throughout the year on the Egyptian stage. Confidence once established, another loan may surely be raised to make good the deficit, and a new point of departure may be made with the increasing European administrations. Whether it was the scarf of the officer of the guard, whether it was a cup of coffee, or whether, as many say, it was the Nile itself which did the work, will perhaps never be known; but that Ismaïl Pasha Saddyk was murdered by order or hint from the Khedive, no reasonable man in Egypt doubts. There was no one so simple as to believe the story which was circulated that, overcome by frenzy at his fall, the Moufettich had drunk himself to death. That he was a scoundrel of the deepest dye, a grinder of the face of the poor, a robber, a bad example, and a 'great stumbling 'block to any chance of financial reform or honest administration,' is undoubted; and one is inclined to endorse the opinion of Mr. Vivian that his fall, however it was brought about, could only be regarded as a great public benefit. At the same time we must not lose sight of the fact that he was destroyed by the man who had made such services as his necessary, and whose constant and urgent demands for money which he must have known could not have come legitimately into, or out of, the Treasury, were complied with by recourse to whip and bastinado, and by the grossest violation of all rights of property.

With the fall of the Moufettich the path of the European administrators became immediately smoothed. His death was a sign that the Khedive intended apparently to break with the past, and, throwing all blame upon the dead, to join hands with his European officials in an earnest attempt to reform abuses,

to 'purge sack, and live cleanly as a gentleman should.' It would hardly be possible to refuse material aid to so interesting a penitent, and to so vigorous a denouncer of the bad courses into which he had been led. Aid was given, but not in the way desired. The false figures and lying statements which had misled Mr. Cave, had had their counterparts in the evidence furnished to Mr. Goschen, with the necessary result that some of his calculations were seriously impaired. At the same time, the executive having remained entirely in the hands of the Khedive's officers, the machinery for establishing an equilibrium had been thrown completely out of gear. So serious a falling off was there in the several branches of revenue, owing to the diversion of receipts *par ordre supérieur*, that in September 1877 a financial crisis was imminent. Captain Baring and Baron de Malaret left Egypt to consult Messrs. Goschen and Joubert on the critical state of affairs; and Mr. Vivian, at the end of November and throughout December, ceaselessly advocated the proposal, which had been made as the outcome of the crisis, that an International Commission, armed with the fullest powers, should make a searching investigation into the actual position of Egyptian finance, and into the resources of the country. Lord Derby, on December 19, authorised Mr. Vivian officially to urge the acceptance by the Khedive of this enquiry, as the 'only means left of extricating 'him from his difficulties.' Meantime, not only was the service of the public debt in part suspended, but the troops and the civil *employés* had been unpaid for many months, judgments of the mixed tribunals multiplied daily but remained unexecuted, the crushing load of interest rolled on, and the situation was desperate. Ismail Pasha knew well enough that his reputation could not survive such an enquiry as was proposed, and strove with all his might to avert it, or to make it a sham. But the united attitude of the foreign Governments, the intolerable annoyance of bankruptcy, and, above all, a rising spirit of hostility towards him in the provinces, in the unpaid army, and in the great towns, compelled a surrender at discretion. It was not till March 30, 1878, after much doubling and winding, and vain attempts to get 'sovereign 'rights' guaranteed, that the decree was issued constituting the Commission, with M. Ferdinand de Lesseps as president, Mr. Rivers Wilson and Riaz Pasha as vice-presidents, and Messrs. Baravelli, Baring, de Blignières, and Kremer as members.

The Commission met for the first time on April 13, and rung the knell of those principles of government which had

been introduced by Mohammed Ali—principles which suited admirably the transition stage in which Egypt was in his time, and which worked efficiently so long as there was a firm and ubiquitous despot like Mohammed to apply them. But the principle of *l'Etat c'est moi* was never more discredited than under Ismaïl Pasha, who used his vast centralised power merely as an instrument of self-aggrandisement. By means of it he had drawn into his own hands and into those of his family a million acres of the cultivable land of Egypt, and, by manipulating in his own interest the taxes exigible from them, had practically flung upon the proprietors of the other four-fifths of the soil the burden of the State expenses. By employing his power as the sole disposer of Egyptian men's lives and property, he had not scrupled to work his private lands by *corvées* which were and still are indispensable for some public works, but which are lawful for them only.

The same principles of government still form the basis of rule in Egypt. They happen to be used beneficently at present because the Khedive Tewfik Pasha pleases to have it so, and because circumstances favour the pressure by foreign Governments to the same end. But, in the absence of some sort of representation of the people, there is not only no guarantee against the repetition of Ismaïlism in the future, but there is absolutely no way by which the voice of complaint or remonstrance can be heard. It is no part of our present purpose to sketch out a constitution for Egypt. Such a work would require much care and forethought, and account would have to be taken of the habits of a people accustomed for centuries to submit in silence to apparent destiny in whatever guise it came. But a sham representation such as Ismaïl dangled in the world's eyes when he convoked the Assembly of Notables, was only a blind to screen oppression. Men paid as much as 500*l.* to the Khedive to get nominated to this assembly, in order that they might acquire in their districts a greater authority and a larger power of enriching themselves.

Early in June Shérif Pasha, who held the portfolios of Foreign Affairs and of Justice, refused to appear before the Commission. He offered to answer in writing any questions the Commissioners might send, but declined to appear in person. The Commission persisted in their demand, the Khedive stood neutral, and Shérif Pasha—who, in Mr. Vivian's opinion and in the opinion of many more, was 'a high-minded and 'honourable Minister, loyal and straightforward in his conduct'—resigned. This was the only 'incident' which marked the

course of the inquiry. On August 20 the report was presented by Mr. Rivers Wilson, in the absence of M. de Lesseps ; and Nubar Pasha, who had been called to the presidency of the Council after Shérif Pasha's resignation, urged upon the Khedive the unconditional acceptance of its conclusions.

The conclusions were these :—

1. No tax to be levied except by virtue of a law published in an official manner.

2. The legislative power to be surrounded by such guarantees as to enable the laws relating to taxes to be applied to all inhabitants of Egypt without distinction of nationality.

3. All the machinery of tax-gathering to be under the effective orders of the Ministry of Finance. Local agents to be controlled on the spot by inspectors dependent only on the central administration.

4. Reform of the system of accounts, and the organisation of real budgets.

5. Foundation of a reserve fund to provide against years of bad Nile.

6. Organisation of the dates at which taxes should be paid, so as to enable them to be paid at the time most easy to the taxed.

7. Institution of an independent tribunal for the settlement of all tax questions.

8. Means to be taken to ensure the natives against abuses by authority.

9. Suppression of taxes vexatious in themselves or in the mode of levy.

10. Revision of the land-tax, and the establishment of yearly lists of those liable in accordance with a cadastral survey.

11. Revision of the Customs dues, and of the method of levying the taxes on salt and tobacco.

12. Regularisation of the right to take water from the irrigation canals ; of the manner in which public works should be executed ; and suppression of the *corvée* for all works not of public utility.

13. Rearrangement of the conditions of military service.

To these conclusions the Khedive, whilst thinking them highly inconvenient and from his point of view undesirable, had no very serious opposition to make. But he objected strongly to the demand which was made at the end of the second part of the report, that he should surrender not only his own landed property—the Daira Sanieh and Daira Khassa, containing 505,000 acres which had been already pledged—but

also the 425,729 acres which, with an eye to a rainy day, he had bestowed among the members of his family. He made counter-propositions, some of which were an insult to the intelligence of the Commissioners; he strove to evade the full severity of the blow, but he yielded in the end, stipulating only that the family should be paid the value of the live stock and material on the properties. By decree dated October 26, 1878, the lands of the Khedivial family were formally ceded for ever to the State, subject to the formalities required by the Mussulman law; and they were at once made the basis of negotiations for a loan of 8,500,000*l.*, with which the Commissioners of Enquiry believed the situation might be saved. This loan was the State Domain loan, taken up by Messrs. Rothschild of London and Paris, on condition that the management of the pledged estates should be vested in three Commissioners, whereof two to be officially named by the Governments of England and France, and to be irremovable without the previously obtained consent of those Powers.

The Commission of Enquiry began by ascertaining that there was no such thing as a budget, and that the principle of the public accounts was radically false. Some Ministries showed only net receipts after deducting expenses of which no account was given. The Public Works Minister ignored, on his sheet of the estimates, the money he received for irrigation works connected with the Nile; and the Minister of War neither showed nor accounted for the money paid in substitution of military service. No notice was taken by the Government that the figures of the Ministry of Finance differed from those of the administrative departments in respect of identical matters. Taxes were levied on the order of a Minister of Finance. 'On le doit,' said the Inspector-General of Lower Egypt, speaking of an illegal tax, 'au zèle d'un moudir d'autrefois. Le Ministère des Finances, ayant remarqué ce produit parmi les recettes réalisées, l'a maintenu sur les budgets.' The verbal order of the Khedive was the justification pleaded for some imposts. The Minister of Commerce, by a stroke of his pen, changed specific into *ad valorem* duties. The land-tax was increased or diminished by the valuers according to the gift made by the proprietor of the property, or according to their power in the district. Fishing licenses were still charged on the inhabitants of villages whose powers of enjoying the right of fishing had disappeared years before with the canal that gave rise to the right. Land-tax was levied on lands which the Nile had engulfed, or which had been taken for public works; the tax on date trees, having

been assessed twelve years before, was integrally levied on the land, though the cultivation of dates had diminished under the pressure of the tax. A fixed sum for personal taxes having been required years ago from a village with a thousand inhabitants, the same sum was exacted though the number had been reduced to eight hundred. The Minister of Finance confined his action to telling the governor of a province that he must send a certain sum, and 'le percepteur général ou le 'moudir la recouvre de qui il peut et comme il peut.'

These words cover a multitude of sins. Explained fully, they would tell of Cairo Pashas sent down in special trains with orders to bring back so much on the morrow ; of the use of stick and bastinado in the interval to grind taxes out of men who had already paid their quota, and who had to save their lives by selling their standing crops and by mortgaging their lands to usurers who lent their money at the rate of 60, and in some cases 144, per cent. Every one engaged in the work of levy, from the Pasha envoy down to the clerk who wrote the usurer's contract, profited by the operation.

In connexion with the *corvée*, or unpaid forced labour, on public works—and, as the Commission found, on the Khedive's private works too—there were the grossest abuses. Men who wished not to go to the work, paid a bribe to the manager and were allowed to go free ; the poor, the young, and the old, who could not afford to pay, were driven to work without shelter at night, without food being provided, and without the tools for the canal cleaning or dyke-making for which they were sent. The workmen and the State were alike cheated by the operation, but the eyes of authority were closed in consideration of suitable presents from the *corvée* manager. The method of supplying men for the army was simplicity itself.

'Le recrutement, nous dit un agent consulaire, n'est autre chose qu'une sorte de presse. Un capitaine arrive dans un village et s'adresse tout d'abord au cheik. Ce dernier commence par éliminer les siens, puis il présente le restant de ses hommes. Tout est pris, sauf ceux qui consentent à payer une prime à débattre. L'année suivante, quelquefois dans la même année, un autre capitaine vient : il ne tient aucun compte de ce qu'a fait son devancier, et les mêmes abus recommencent sans qu'on s'occupe de l'âge, du mariage ou des sommes déjà versées.

'Si des soldats désertent, on exige de leurs répondants et de leurs parents leur arrestation personnelle ou la présentation de deux hommes en remplacement d'un seul et que ces deux hommes soient de leurs plus proches parents.' *

* Lettre du Ministre de la Guerre en date du 26 juin 1878.

Par ordre supérieur money had been taken from the chest of the pious foundations, and from the funds left for making a provision for orphans, and the way in which Ismail had possessed himself of large tracts of good land bore an exact resemblance to the manner in which Ahab became proprietor of Naboth's vineyard. From this the reader may be led to agree with the Commissioners that, besides administrative reforms, nothing less than the absolute surrender of the ill-gotten lands would meet the justice of the case. Those who care to trace the history of these estates will find what they want in the report of the State Domain Commissioners, which we have not space to review.

With the advent of Nubar Pasha to power the English policy in Egypt changed front. So far from hanging back, the Government rather took a lead in Egyptian internal affairs. Leave was granted for two years to Mr. Rivers Wilson, to enable him to undertake, but without any responsibility on the part of the English Government, the post of Finance Minister; an English Commissioner was nominated for the first time by the Government, to assist a French and an Egyptian Commissioner in the management of the lands ceded by the Khedivial family and affected to the Rothschild loan; the English agent at Cairo was directed officially to warn the Khedive of the responsibility that would rest with him as regards the success or failure of the new *régime*—a responsibility which might even affect the dynasty. Here is what Mr. Vivian reports of the Khedive's answer to his communication:—

‘The Khedive listened to me most attentively; and, when I had finished, said, with evident signs of great annoyance, that it was one of the most serious and painful communications he had ever received from her Majesty's Government, and that he regretted deeply that they should have thought it necessary to hold language to him which he thought was undeserved and unjust. Hitherto, the advice given to him by her Majesty's Government had always been dictated by evident *bienveillance* for himself and his dynasty, but now it seemed as if they had taken a *parti pris* against him.

‘Moreover, the responsibility they sought to cast upon him for the successful result of the new order of things, and for the due entry of the taxes, was neither logical nor just, and he must entirely disclaim it. What was his present position in Egypt? He had surrendered his personal property and his personal power, and deliberately accepted the position of a constitutional prince; a responsible ministry had been formed to advise him; and, if he rightly understood the first principle of constitutional government, it was that the ministers, and not the chief of the State, were made responsible under such circumstances; while, as

to the entry of the taxes, he had no control or power over it, and, therefore, could in no way be held responsible for it.

‘He must decline to meddle with the proper functions of his ministers; his advice or opinion was entirely at their disposal if they chose to ask him for it, but he could not thrust it upon them unasked, and, although he quite understood that he was the person principally interested in the successful working of the new scheme, he could not interfere with the attributes of his ministers, and if they were not responsible for their own acts what was the meaning of a responsible ministry? Responsibility, he thought, could only attach to him if he attempted to interfere improperly in the government of the country; otherwise he must entirely disclaim it.’

This was on December 14, 1878; and there is little doubt that from that time Ismaïl Pasha resolved to lose no opportunity of making difficulties for his new advisers. Addresses were made to him by the Chamber of Notables; deputations of Sheikhs waited upon him who would not have dared to present themselves had they not been encouraged to come; and there were not wanting other signs which induced Mr. Vivian only a month later to remind the Khedive of his warning, and to report home that he believed the Khedive ‘was not a stranger’ to the hostile agitation against the new administration. The truth is, the new administration never had a chance of success. Presided over by a man between whom and the Khedive there was a deep personal hatred of long standing; comprehending among its members a French and an English Minister who had both been active members of the detested Commission d’Enquête; and composed, as regards the native element, of men notoriously opposed to the old *régime*, what could it do against forces which yielded a passive resistance, and which were secretly set in motion by that one imperious will which all men feared and which was deeply irritated?

Every mistake, every misadventure, on the part of the Government was instantly turned against it. The unpaid army and civil service were taught to look to the men who had undertaken to regenerate Egypt for the miracle which should pay them their arrears, till, no miracle being wrought, these poor men, to whom in some cases as much as thirty months’ pay was due, began to regard the Ministers as the cause of their ever-increasing misery. If between the cession and the legal handing over of the Dairas to the State Domains Commissioners, the wise and prudent of their generation took out hypothecations against the Domains which afterwards proved valid, the Government were accused of *laches*, and were vehemently reclaimed against. Moreover, being the visible instruments of power, they were made responsible for the

consequences of those very acts which, as Commissioners of Enquiry, they had denounced. The irony of the situation was complete when, on February 19, 1879, Nubar Pasha and Mr. Wilson were mobbed and assaulted, and kept prisoners for some time in their Ministries by a number of unpaid officers of the army.

Those who knew the character of the late Viceroy must reject the theory that he got up the riot. It is probable that he knew of the intention to hold the meeting of officers; more than likely that he foresaw the possibility of a disturbance, and that he determined to profit by it if it happened, in order to discredit Nubar Pasha and the Ministry. But he was himself rudely undeceived on the occasion; for he found for the first time that his personal orders were not only not obeyed, but that when he spoke there were murmurs and remonstrances. He incurred, moreover, personal danger when force was used and shots were fired to clear the ground of the malcontents.

But he instantly seized on the incident to crush Nubar. He declared he could not hold back the national animosity to the Minister, and that he would not answer for order if Nubar Pasha remained. Nubar resigned; the Governments interested began a correspondence as to his successor; and the other Ministers, instead of resigning with their chief, remained in office and became the fresh subjects of a so-called popular agitation. On April 8 the whole of the late Ministry were dismissed without notice beyond that which they had from the decree in the monition recalling Shérif Pasha to power. The Commission d'Enquête resigned in a body, the Commissioners of the Public Debt protested formally against the new financial scheme which Shérif Pasha put forward, and the Commissioners of the Domains telegraphed to Messrs. Rothschild that in their opinion the administration of the estates was impossible under the new Ministry. On April 22 a Viceregal decree promulgated a hastily prepared scheme of settlement for the public debts, the main feature of which was the 'open and direct violation' of acquired rights, and of 'the international obligations which the Egyptian Government assumed when they adopted the judicial reform.'

From April to June were months of intrigue, of attempts to assert the existence of a national party 'to whose legitimate aspirations' the Khedive felt it 'a sacred duty, as chief of the State, to give expression,' and of vain endeavour to grapple with a situation complicated by the fact that the contemptuous dismissal of the Ministry which had the confidence of Europe, and which contained an Englishman and a French-

man, had arrayed against the Viceroy the active hostility of the great Powers.

Application was made to the Sultan to know if he would dismiss Ismaïl from his stewardship. The Sultan—glad to recover at a blow the power which Mohammed Ali by dint of fighting, and his successors by the free use of bribes, had wrested from the Sultanate—consented; but tried to make the consent conditional on his being allowed to break the principle of an hereditary Khedivate. Halim Pasha, a Turk of Turks, and one smarting under a sense of injustice done to him by Egypt, was the Sultan's candidate. But he was not the man likely to suit the objects the Powers had in view. Mohammed Tewfik Pasha, Ismaïl's eldest son, had shown proofs of good sense, of capacity, and of courage during the dark days of his father's reign. He had become obnoxious to his father as one who was disposed to give up the family tradition of everything out of the people, and as little as possible for them. He had shown ability as President of the Council after the fall of Nubar, and had resigned when he found that it was impossible to continue in office without throwing himself unreservedly into the hands of the Turkish party.

The English and French Governments were actively corresponding with the Porte and with each other on this point when, on May 18, the German Consul-General at Cairo, acting on orders from Berlin, went to Abdin and officially informed the Khedive that Germany did not recognise the Decrees of April 22. This step, nicely calculated to touch French *amour propre* to the quick, was the best trump in the hands that remained to be played. The hands of the two great Powers most interested in Egypt were forced, and there was nothing left but to follow the suit of the German, who, content with his odd trick, abandoned the game.

On June 7 the English and French Consuls-General made declaration that their Governments entertained the same opinions as the German Government; and on the 19th they informed the Khedive that his only chance of saving his dynasty in Egypt was for him to abdicate. 'Monseigneur,' said the French Envoy—when Ismaïl, utterly bewildered and overcome, asked time to consider his answer—'show yourself 'worthy of a grandson of Mohammed Ali.' The hunted stag standing at bay, and conscious that there was no escape, found time to laugh at this appeal, and to say with bitterness that, if it was only in the act of deposition that he was invited to prove himself worthy of his great ancestor, the reference might have been spared.

The rest of the story is soon told and is well known. On June 26, the firman of deposition arrived, and the same evening the guns of Salaheddin's citadel thundered a welcome to the new Effendina, Mohammed Tewfik.

Great was the astonishment of the Powers when they found that the new Viceroy maintained Shérif Pasha as the President of his Council, and protested in the most earnest manner against the attempt of the French Government to make him take M. de Blignières back into the Ministry; that he showed unmistakable signs of being 'a regular Turk;' and that, while he declared his intention of executing the wishes of Europe in respect of Egypt's money obligations to Europe, he insisted upon the right of Egypt to govern herself. It may be as well for those who are interested in the future of that country to bear these facts in mind, and to remember that it was with the greatest unwillingness the present Khedive consented to dismiss Shérif Pasha from his Council, and that it was with remonstrance he agreed to the reiterated demand of the French Government to accept M. de Blignières as one of the Controllers-General. Riaz Pasha was recalled from exile to preside over the Council, and to take the portfolios of Finance and of the Interior.

The great fact of the imminent bankruptcy of the State dominated the situation, and it was clear to the most anti-European Egyptian that without European help there could be no escape from disaster. The whole mass of unregulated debt on which the Commission d'Enquête had advised, remained to be dealt with: cankering interest accumulated; new judgments against the Government were being signed every day; and an important part of the Domain Loan, which a year before it was thought might suffice to meet the case of Egyptian difficulties, had been declared by the Supreme Court to be liable for the payment in full of those judgment creditors who had inscribed hypothecs against the Domain estates.

For a time it was hoped that the efforts of Major Baring and M. de Blignières, the Controllers-General—two irresponsible men without votes, whom the Council could not get rid of, and whose disapprobation was of more moment than the collective votes of all their responsible colleagues—would have sufficed to bring the Egyptian ship to port. If continuous hard work, and the most devoted application to what they thought right, could have done it, these gentlemen would have succeeded in their work. But the fact that Viceregal decrees, which were binding on all Egyptians, were held not to bind the mixed tribunals dealing with questions where Europeans were parties

to the suit, was an insuperable bar to all endeavour. Unless means could be found to make a law which should oblige the mixed courts to recognise Government schemes of liquidation, the Controllers and the Ministry might as well weave ropes of sand.

Convinced of this patent fact, the Powers who took part in the establishment of the mixed tribunals in Egypt, signed an agreement engaging each other to recognise as binding the decisions of an International Commission of Liquidation of which the constitution had been arranged. On April 5, 1880, the Khedive signed a decree nominating the Commission of Liquidation, under the presidency of Sir Rivers Wilson, and appointing another English delegate, two French delegates, one Italian, one Austrian, one German, and one Egyptian delegate. By the end of July the Commission had presented its report; of which it may be said briefly that it not only settled the floating debt upon terms which surprised and contented the creditors, but it dealt with the long-vexed question of the position and obligations of the Daira Sanieh, with the conversion of the consolidated debts, with the difficulties flowing out of the repeal of the law of the Moukabalah, and with the involved questions of the Civil List. Four months after the excitement consequent upon the settlement had worn off, Egyptian stocks stood at the prices in the following list, which also shows the price of the same stocks before the Commission was appointed:—

March 1880 December 1880

7 per cent. 1864	82 $\frac{1}{2}$	90
9 " 1867	84	93
5 " 1877 Preference	87	94 $\frac{3}{4}$
6 " 1877 Unified	57 $\frac{1}{4}$	70
7 " 1866 Viceroy's	80 $\frac{1}{2}$	91 $\frac{1}{2}$
5 " Daira Sanieh	67 $\frac{1}{2}$	78
Daira Khassa	64	80

The State Domain Loan was excluded from the jurisdiction of the Commission, having been already regulated on bases so seemingly secure that the loan which was brought out at 73 in October 1878, in December 1880 was at 97 $\frac{1}{2}$.

So much for the latest financial history of Egypt. It remains only to notice one or two points connected with administrative matters in the future. The Khedive with his patience, with his hearty concurrence in all steps that will get his country out of entanglement, and with his evident desire

to set a good example of economy and good faith, is as good a Mussulman as ever asserted the unity of God. His President of the Council, Riaz Pasha, an honest, well-meaning, and hard-working man, recognises the efforts of Europeans to get the country straight, while he does not forget that Europeans contributed enormously and even shamefully to build up the Egyptian debt. He fully shares with his master the feeling that Egypt should be ruled by the Egyptians, and he heartily dislikes the footing which circumstances have enabled Europeans to get in the administration of the country. He sees the railways, the port of Alexandria, the telegraphs, the Customs, the Post Office in their hands, and with no less dislike he sees a ninth of cultivated Egypt, under the title of the State Domains, administered by a Commission of three, of whom two are Europeans, irremovable without the previously obtained sanction of their own Governments. His ideal is to all appearance far from realisation. He is a member of five orders of Christian knighthood. But he would willingly resign these and all outside marks of approval could he see the Europeans quit of the country. If these are the sentiments of a man who has been several times in Europe, who has worked intimately with Europeans, and who has borrowed from them many of the qualities through which he has attained high office, what are the feelings of those less instructed Egyptians who hate the European because he is an infidel, and despise him for refusing bribes, and for preventing them from getting them? The best chance for the fellah lies in the continuance and extension of the European influence. It is a mere accident that his native rulers are to-day well disposed towards him. He has absolutely no guarantee for the future so long as the governmental principles of Mohammed Ali are left without control.

That he thinks so may be inferred from the fact that very lately he took matters into his own hands, when the acts of the Minister of War had rendered that officer obnoxious to him. In January of this year the colonels of three Arab regiments of the Egyptian army petitioned the Khedive for the removal of the War Minister, a Turk, on the ground that he favoured Turkish and Circassian officers to the detriment of their Arab comrades. Getting no answer, they called on the President of the Council, and insisted on a Council being held to consider their demand. Riaz Pasha pointed out the dangerous and delicate position which, as soldiers, they were in, but his visitors were resolute. A Council, presided over by the Khedive himself, decided to

arrest the three colonels, and to send them before a court-martial. But whilst the court-martial was settling to its work, the soldiers of the regiments commanded by the prisoners arrived, broke up the court, beat the Under-Secretary for War, released their colonels, and marched back in triumph to their barracks. They then demanded of the Khedive the dismissal of his War Minister and of the Circassian officer of his own staff, demands which had to be complied with because Government disposed of no force capable of overawing the mutineers. This is indeed the reverse of all that Mohammed Ali intended, but it is one of the highly inconvenient possibilities attaching to his system of government. How far it will have the effect of modifying the policy of Egypt for the Egyptians, and of causing the Khedive's Ministers to lean more than they have lately done on European advisers, will be watched with interest by students of the Eastern Question.

The difficulties of European administrators in Egypt lie in the manifestation from time to time of the wounded spirit of the sixty Turkish families who pass for the Egyptian nation; their danger lies in the international character of their administrations. Hitherto all has gone well in the latter respect; but the experiment has not been long on trial, and circumstances have necessitated union. It remains to be seen what will be the effect of easier external conditions upon international solidarity in Egypt; whilst the interested observer will not fail to watch narrowly for the growth or decline of that anti-European spirit which certainly exists, no matter how closely it be veiled.

ART. III.—*The Song of Roland Translated into English Verse.* By JOHN O'HAGAN, M.A. London: 1880.

FRENCH literature, and the French language itself, have often had to sustain the charge of being unpoetical, notwithstanding the great influence exercised by French models over English poetry during the eighteenth century. No doubt there is truth in the charge, so far as modern French literature is concerned; nor can the dignity of the classic French dramatists be accepted as compensation for the lack of that high imagination and ardent passion to which we are accustomed in the best poetry of Greece, Italy, and England. But France has an appeal from her later to her earlier poetry—an appeal to which few except native readers have hitherto been capable of doing

justice, owing to the difficulty of reading early French. Poetry addresses the whole being with all its manifold sympathies, not the understanding alone. For the latter faculty, indeed, it suffices if we can with time and attention reach the meaning of a difficult book ; but the poetic sympathies, before they can make due response, must take in that meaning almost simultaneously with the understanding, closing upon it with an electric swiftness. All truths admit of exceptions : but, for the most part, the poetry that delights us does not bring its meaning home to us by slow touches, but flashes it on the finer intelligence as the photographic image stamps itself on the sensitive plate. The obscure is commonly the unpoetical. It is for this reason that while foreigners have heard of the great French mediæval poem, the ‘*Chanson de Roland*,’ by many critics affirmed to be the true French epic, it has been read by few, and by these chiefly in the spirit of antiquarians. Even to French readers the difficulty of the early language has been a great obstacle to the circulation of the poem in its original form ; and while but a few of Chaucer’s poems have been modernised in England, the whole of the ‘*Chanson de Roland*’ has been several times translated into modern French. Of these versions, as of the translations into other languages, Mr. O’Hagan gives an account in a preface marked by learning and discrimination. Only two years ago M. Petit de Julleville published a version, like the original poem, in assonant rhyme ; that is, rhymes confined to the vowel sounds. Versions ‘altogether unrhymed’ have been published by M. Gautier, M. Genin, and M. d’Avril. In early times ‘as the French ear grew more cultivated, it became intolerant of the merely assonant rhyme ; hence the *rifaccimenti* (*remaniements*) or refashionings of the poem according to the taste of a later time.’ (Preface, p. 35.) From an early period many translations of this poem, adopted apparently as the great type of the chivalrous romance in verse, were made into foreign languages. A German priest, Conrad, was the author of the earlier Latin and of the German translation, supposed to have been made about A.D. 1173. Stricker modified the latter so as to correspond with a later form of the German language. In the library of St. Mark at Venice there is a celebrated version in Italianised French, including many adventures not in the original poem. The fame of the work extended even to Iceland ; and it is substantially included in the ‘*Carlomagnus Saga*,’ a compilation of the thirteenth century. The Danish translation belongs to the fifteenth century, and is still popular. In the same century Flemish translations appeared. In the

Irish 'Book of Lismore' a narrative of the conquest of Charlemagne is found.

'The fate of the legend in Spain was singular, and yet most natural. National jealousy displaced religious zeal, and the disaster of Roncesvalles began to be classed as a *Spanish* victory. The hero who slew Roland in the battle became no other than the famous Bernardo del Carpio.' (P. 40.)

The revival of the theme in later Italy had in it, as might have been expected, but little of the spirit of chivalry, while its outward forms were often preserved but in mockery.

'Pulci is the only poet among the Italian Cinquecentisti who even attempts to portray the disaster of Roncesvalles. Ariosto pursues a different flight—

"Le donne, i cavalier, gli armi, gl' amori."

His poem is a wondrous kaleidoscope—a perpetually shifting scene of love and enchantment, winged horses, warrior maidens, fountains of desire and hatred, and a thousand other delightful fooleries.' (P. 42.)

In England alone the great romance of Charlemagne and Roland created comparatively little interest; for there the national imagination was preoccupied by the tale of Arthur and his Knights. It is curious to observe that while, wherever this flower of poetry was transplanted, the blossom modified itself according to the character of the soil, in one land it submitted to no change—the region in which the great disaster took place. As Charlemagne was withdrawing his army from northern Spain, about A.D. 778, the Basques of the Pyrenees, who regarded him as the invader of their country, dashed down from their mountain heights upon his rear-guard and overwhelmed it. Their estimate of that achievement remained unaffected by religion and by time. To them the cause at issue was ever the cause of their country; and their ballads of Roncesvalles ever stormed against the early wrong. Mr. O'Hagan gives us specimens of them.

'What came they to do in our mountains, these men of the north? Why came they hither to disturb our peace? God made the mountains for men to transgress them not. The rocks hurled down fall on the invaders, and crush them. Their blood flows; their flesh quivers; their bones are shattered. Fly, fly, ye who have strength and a steed! Fly, King Charlemagne, with thy dark plumes and thy crimson vesture! Thy nephew, thy bravest, Roland, lies dead below!'

The 'Chanson de Roland' was thus, like most of the chief 'national' poems, the stately outgrowth from a soil enriched during centuries by a multitude of popular lays which successively grew up and perished. These earlier lays are sup-

posed to have been written, some in a Teutonic dialect, and some in a rude Gaulish Latin; but they survive only in the 'Song' which they inspired, and probably had been only transmitted orally. The 'Chanson' is believed to have been composed about the year 1100, the earliest known MS. of it having apparently been written by a scribe who lived fifty years later. The poem was thus posterior to the event it records by about 320 years; while it preceded the 'Divina Commedia' by about two centuries, and the 'Canterbury Tales' of Chaucer, which may take place as the third and last of the great mediæval poems, by about three. Its language is the *Langue d'oïl* of northern France, and the metre is decasyllabic; the stanzas, which are of unequal length, retaining, each of them throughout, the same assonant rhyme. Mr. O'Hagan has done well not to imitate that species of rhyme, which is surely in every respect worse than unsatisfactory. It is perpetually defrauding the ear while it excites its craving; for, the vowel sounds alone, at the end of each line, being made to resemble each other, while the consonantal sounds are ignored, the resemblance is apparent only, and the cheat is at once detected. Moreover, however much skill may be evinced when a single rhyme is carried on through a page or more—and singular ability as well as industry has been thus sometimes shown in translations—no corresponding delight could be the result even if the rhyme were a true one; for the pleasure derived from rhyme is that afforded by alternated resemblance and dissimilitude of terminal sounds; and it is consequently destroyed by monotony. This species of rhyme, however wearisome, may at least be consistent with freedom when the language used is one of those in which the final sounds of words are so often similar that to avoid rhymes is as difficult as to find them; but the northern poet who has to make his way through long paragraphs of assonant rhyme is compelled to walk in chains. Milton himself could not have written the lyrical parts of his 'Comus' in assonants without the gravest injury both to their harmony and their freedom.

Mr. O'Hagan's is the first English translation of the 'Chanson'; nor can we doubt that by its aid that poem, so long unknown among us, will be permanently made familiar to English readers. He has selected for translation M. Léon Gautier's edition, including some stanzas inserted from the Venetian version; and on the other hand excluding the episode of the Emir Baligant, which has been regarded by M. d'Avril and other French authorities as not authentic, and which, in his judgment, injures the proportions of the poem and intro-

duces details of battle which are but repetition. We cannot doubt that he has exercised a wise discretion, since the single combats are, even as the poem stands, somewhat too like each other for modern readers, though they were doubtless enjoyed by those for whom they were composed, as much as the corresponding incidents of the ‘*Iliad*’ were enjoyed by the Greek. The metre he has used is ‘the mixed iambic and anapæstic ‘metre of “*Christabel*,” the “*Siege of Corinth*,” and the “*Bridal of Triermain*”’—a metre well suited to the subject, and which he has used for the most part with grace and spirit. His diction resembles that of Scott more than the elaborate diction of a later day. Poetic diction has in recent times been refined into a singular exquisiteness and expressiveness; but its very charm is sometimes a seduction, and draws the reader’s attention, and perhaps the poet’s no less, unduly from the subject matter to the language. A plainer diction is more suited to a plain, heroic theme. ‘Subjective’ and sentimental poetry may require the rich colour thus cast upon it: poetry of a more primitive kind embodies incidents which speak for themselves.

It is time to give extracts from this far-famed poem; and to make them more intelligible we shall include with them a brief analysis of the tale. Charlemagne had entered Spain with a huge army to deliver her from the yoke of the Moslem conqueror. Seven years of war had placed that country in his hands, except the city of Saragossa. Marsilius, its King, sends a deputation to the Emperor, offering all but a surrender: and the terms, though not without suspicion of treachery on his part, are accepted. There was room for the doubt. Marsilius had adopted his device at the suggestion of a crafty courtier, Blancaudrin, who thus delivers his master’s message:—

‘Marsil, our King, doth his greeting send.
 Much hath he mused on the law of grace,
 Much of his wealth at your feet will place—
 Bears and lions, and dogs of chase,
 Seven hundred camels that bend the knee,
 A thousand hawks that have moulted free,
 Four hundred mules with silver and gold
 Which fifty wains might scantily hold;
 So shall you have of the red bezants
 To pay the soldiers of gentle France.
 Over long you have dwelt in Spain—
 To Aix, your city, return again.
 The Lord I serve will thither come,
 Accept the law of Christendom,

With clasped hands your liegeman be,
And hold his realm of you in fee.'

Charlemagne consults his council.

' Scarce his speech did the Emperor close
When in high displeasure Count Roland rose,
Fronted his uncle upon the spot,
And said, "This Marsil, believe him not!"'

Ganelon rises next, and urges that the terms should be accepted. Ganelon is the traitor of the romance. He had wedded Charlemagne's sister, and was Roland's step-father; but he hates his step-son, who, in turn, despises and often insults him. The Emperor accepts Ganelon's advice, and Roland at once proposes that his step-father should be the knight selected as envoy to Marsil's Court, and should notify that acceptance.

' Count Ganelon then was with anguish wrung,
His mantle of fur from his neck he flung,
Stood all stark in his silken vest,
And his grey eyes gleamed with a fierce unrest.

"I promise to work thee scathe and strife
Long as thou breathest the breath of life."

He imagines, though without ground, that Roland desires his death, and believes that the Moslem king will slay any envoy sent to him, as he had done on a previous occasion. Roland laughs at his dismay; and he sets out on his mission. But he plans his revenge. He whispers to King Marsil, that while Roland lives the Emperor will never be allowed to remain long at peace with him. He then suggests a plot, to be carried into effect during the Emperor's retreat through the Pyrenees.

"Through Cizra's pass will the Emperor wind,
But his rear will linger in march behind;
Roland and Olivier there shall be,
With twenty thousand in company.
Muster your battle against them then,
A hundred thousand heathen men,
Till worn and spent be the Frankish bands,
Though your bravest perish beneath their hands.
For another battle your powers be massed;
Roland will sink overcome at last.
That were a feat of arms indeed,
And your life from peril thenceforth be freed." (P. 83.)

The plot succeeds: the day for the Emperor's retreat arrives. All the preceding night he is troubled by ominous dreams.

In the morning he demands of his counsellors, 'Who shall command our rear-guard as we pass through the mountain defiles?' Ganelon at once replies, 'Roland.' Karl frowns, but consents. Roland accepts the perilous charge; but he divines his step-sire's treachery.

'Fiercely once more Count Roland turned
To speak the scorn that in him burned.
"Ha! deem'st thou, dastard of dastard race,
That I shall drop the glove in place,
As, in sight of Karl, thou didst drop the mace?"

Then of his uncle he made demand:
"Yield me the bow that you hold in hand;
Never of me shall the tale be told,
As of Ganelon erst, that it failed my hold."
Sadly the Emperor bowed his head,
With working finger his beard he spread,
Tears in his own despite he shed.

Count Roland sprang to a hill-top's height,
And donned his peerless armour bright;
Laced his helm, for a baron made;
Girt Durindana, gold-hilted blade;
Around his neck he hung the shield,
With flowers emblazoned was the field;
Nor steed but Veillantif will ride;
And he grasped his lance with its pennon's pride.
White was the pennon with rim of gold;
Low to the handle the fringes rolled.
Who are his lovers men now may see;
And the Franks exclaim, "We will follow thee!"

(P. 92.)

Twenty thousand warriors claim admission to the rear-guard, including the twelve great Paladins; but in the mean time, a hundred thousand Moslems have secretly occupied the neighbouring mountains. Twelve Moslem princes vow themselves to the encounter of the twelve Christian Paladins. They have come from the remotest parts of the East. Here is a sketch of one of them:—

'Cherunbles is there, from the valley black,
His long hair makes on the earth its track;
A load, when it lists him, he bears in play,
Which four mules' burthen would well outweigh.
Men say, in the land where he was born,
Nor shineth sun, nor springeth corn,
Nor falleth rain, nor droppeth dew;
The very stones are of sable hue.' (P. 101.)

Ere long the innumerable foes descend from their ambush.
The apparition excites no alarm in the Christian host.

“Sir comrade,” said Olivier, “I trow
There is battle at hand with the Saracen foe.”
“God grant,” said Roland, “it may be so.
Here our post for our King we hold;
For his lord the vassal bears heat and cold,
Toil and peril endureth for him,
Risks in his service both life and limb.
For mighty blows let our arms be strung,
Lest songs of scorn be against us sung.
With the Christian is good, with the heathen ill;
No dastard part shall ye see me fill.”

This instinct of loyalty, ever ready to bear and forbear, Roland shows even towards the traitor himself. As the whole Saracen force advances, Olivier exclaims :—

“Ganelon wrought this perfidy;
It was he who doomed us to hold the rear.”
“Hush,” said Roland; “O Olivier,
No word be said of my step-sire here!”

He was himself once less generous to Ganelon; but a great crisis always calls out what is noblest in a noble character. This is one of the countless touches of delicate discrimination with which the poem abounds. Olivier warns his friend that they are fatally outnumbered, and tells him—but in vain—that one hope only remains.

“In mighty strength are the heathen crew,”
Olivier said, “and our Franks are few;
My comrade, Roland, sound on your horn;
Karl will hear and his host return.”
“’Twere mad,” said Roland, “to do such deed;
Lost in France were my glory’s need.”

“O Roland, sound on your ivory horn,
To the ear of Karl shall the blast be borne:
He will bid his legions backward bend,
And all his barons their aid shall lend.”
“Now God forbid it for very shame,
That for me my kindred were stained with blame.”

“Roland, Roland, yet wind one blast!
Karl will hear ere the gorge be passed,
And the Franks return on their path full fast.”
“I will not sound on mine ivory horn:
It shall never be spoken of me in scorn,
That for heathen felons one blast I blew:
I may not dishonour my lineage true.

But I will strike, ere this fight be o'er,
A thousand strokes, and seven hundred and more,
And my Durindana shall drop with gore.

Death were better than fame laid low.
Our Emperor loveth a downright blow." (P. 140.)

Archbishop Turpin is a man of might beyond all the other Paladins save two—"Roland the daring and Olivier wise." He is of the order of those mailed prelates of the Middle Ages who smote hard 'for the love of charity.' It is thus that he prepares the crusading host for a hopeless conflict with the sons of the False Prophet.

'Archbishop Turpin, above the rest,
Spurred his steed to a jutting crest:
His sermon thus to the Franks he spake:—
"Lords, we are here for our monarch's sake;
Hold we for him, though our death should come;
Fight for the succour of Christendom.
The battle approaches—ye know it well,
For ye see the ranks of the Infidel.
Cry *mea culpa*, and lowly kneel;
I will assoil you, your souls to heal.
In death ye are holy martyrs crowned."
The Franks alighted, and knelt on ground;
In God's high name the host he blest,
And for penance he gave them --to smite their best.'

The conflict consists not of one battle but of many. In the first the twenty thousand have the advantage over the hundred thousand, and the twelve Paynim champions are successively slain by the twelve Paladins. But through a defile among the mountain, Almaris, a Saracen king, pushes his way with 'sixty thousand of heathendom,' and the numbers of the Franks are woefully diminished. A nobly conceived incident is here introduced. A storm, such as man had never witnessed before, sweeps over the whole breadth of 'gentle France.'

'And an earthquake ran—the sooth I say—
From Besançon city to Wissant bay;
From Saint Michael's mount to thy shrine, Cologne,
House unlifted was there none.
And a darkness spread in the noontide high—
No light save gleams from the cloven sky.
On all who saw came a mighty fear:
They said, "The end of the world is near."
Alas! they spake with idle breath—
'Tis the great lament for Roland's death.' (P. 126.)

Yet the huge army of Margaris is defeated, and the King escapes with but few companions.

‘ On his body were four lance wounds to see :
Were he Christian, what a baron he ! ’

He makes his way to King Marsil, who promptly reaches the field with a new army, seven thousand trumpets sounding his onset. Again the Archbishop blesses the soldiers of the Cross.

“ Soldiers and lieges of God are ye,
And in Paradise shall your guerdon be.
To lie on its holy flowerets fair---
Dastard never shall enter there.”

Another battle ensues : twelve more Moslem chiefs single out the twelve Paladins ; but this time the Frank dies as well as the Saracen. Still, for a time the issue hangs in suspense. At last King Marsil brings up the last division of his army, the Frankish host is overwhelmed by sheer weight of numbers, and of the Paladins but the three greatest survive. Four times they rally their little remnant, reduced ere long to sixty men. Roland looks ruefully round on his dead Franks : he then turns to his brother-in-arms, whose reply, scorning, when it comes from another and comes too late, the counsel which he had himself urged earlier, indicates that Olivier is no mere abstraction of wisdom and friendship. The man is not lost in the chivalrous ideal.

‘ Said Roland, “ Our battle goes hard, I fear ;
I will sound on my horn that Karl may hear.”
“ ’Twere a deed unknightly,” said Olivier ;
“ Thou didst disdain when I sought and prayed :
Saved had we been with our Karl to aid ;
Unto him and his host no blame should be :
By this my beard, might I hope to see
My gentle sister Alda’s face,
’Thou should’st never hold her in thine embrace.

No service more unto Karl we pay,
The first of men, till the judgment day.
Thou shalt die, and France dishonoured be,
Ended our loyal company—
A woful parting this eve shall see.” ’ (Pp. 145, 146.)

Archbishop Turpin easily appeases the gentle strife. The horn shall be sounded : Karl will return not wholly too late. The Franks will dismount when they find the field covered with their dead, and weep while they lay them in hallowed earth.

“ Nor wolf nor boar on our limbs shall feed ”—
Said Roland ; “ yea, ’tis a goodly rede.”

Roland draws the horn to his lips—

“ The mountain peaks soared high around,
Thirty leagues was borne the sound,
Karl hath heard it, and all his band.
“ Our men have battle,” he said, “ on hand : ”
Ganelon rose in front and cried,
“ If another spake, I would say he lied.” (P. 147.)

The ‘ thirty leagues ’ is one of those amusing extravagances not seldom to be found in this poem. Strikingly in contrast with them are the brief but significant touches of a pathos often more exquisite than is to be found in the poetry of ages less rude. The barbaric need have nothing in it of the savage. With its wildness and rudeness it mingles a refinement enhanced by the contrast.

Roland sounds his horn again.

“ It is Roland’s horn,” said the Emperor,
“ And, save in battle, he had not blown.”
“ Battle,” said Ganelon, “ is there none.
Old you have grown—all white and hoar ;
He would sound all day for a single hare.”

He sounds a third time ; but this time his mouth is full of blood.

‘ Said Karl, “ That horn is long of breath.”
Said Naimcs, “ ’Tis Roland who travailleth.” ’

The Emperor at once gives command to return. Ganelon is bound and delivered in charge to the varlets of the kitchen train, who tear his beard, beat him with rods, and lead him on in a chain like a bear. Roland gazes around once more. It is neither of his own loss, nor of his own death, that he thinks.

“ Land of France, thou art soothly fair ;
To-day thou liest bereaved and bare ;
It was all for me your lives ye gave,
And I was helpless to shield or save.”

Again, as before, hundreds and thousands fall beneath the onset of the three surviving Paladins ; but it is in vain. Olivier receives his death-wound. Roland looks on him.

“ Ah, gentle France, thou art overthrown,
Reft of thy bravest, despoiled, and lone ;
The Emperor’s loss is full indeed ! ”
At the word he fainted upon his steed.

Here there follows an incident as touching as it is original:—it reminds one that there exists a characteristic in the wars of the chivalrous age for which we find no counterpart in the ‘Tale of Troy.’

‘Sir Roland there on his charger swooned,
 Olivier smitten with his death-wound.
 His eyes from bleeding are dimmed and dark,
 Nor mortal, near or far, can mark;
 And when his comrade beside him pressed,
 Fiercely he smote on his golden crest;
 Down to the nasal the helm he shred,
 But passed no further nor pierced his head.
 Roland marvelled at such a blow,
 And thus bespoke him soft and low:
 “Hast thou done it, my comrade, wittingly?
 Roland who loves thee so dear am I,
 Thou hast no quarrel with me to seek?”
 Olivier answered, “I hear thee speak,
 But I see thee not. God seeth thee.
 Have I struck thee, brother? Forgive it me.”
 “I am not hurt, O Olivier;
 And in sight of God I forgive thee here.”
 Then each to each his head hath laid,
 And in love like this was their parting made.’ (P. 157.)

In the hands of later poets, such an incident would have filled more than one page. In early times the poet saw things plainly and felt what was in them, but did not labour to make the most of all he saw. Nature, he knew, could do her work. Art was to let her speak, not to drown her speech in a flood of fine words. The poem, he doubted not, was already existent—in nature;—the poet was the man who could see it there. He was the *Finder* (*Trouvere*), not the *Maker*. His aim was humble; and his work was the greater on that account.

The Saracens at last dare no longer confront Roland and the Archbishop; and it is with lances flung from a distance that they succeed in wounding them mortally. Just then they hear in the distance the trumpets of Charlemagne’s returning army, and fly. Veillantif, Roland’s horse, falls dead: the Archbishop is dying; and Roland, winding his arms around him, places him softly on the sward. He then leaves him for a space to seek their dead companions. He finds ten of the Paladins and lays them at Turpin’s feet.

‘The Archbishop saw them stretched arow,
 Nor can he hinder the tears that flow;
 In benediction his hands he spread:
 “Alas for your doom! my lords, he said,

“That God in mercy your souls may give
 On the flowers of Paradise to live !
 Mine own death cometh, with anguish sore
 That I see mine Emperor no more.” (P. 167.)

Roland renews his search : he finds the body of Olivier, lays it at the Archbishop's feet, and swoons over it. The dying Archbishop rises, takes the horn of Roland, and totters forward towards a distant brook, in hopes that he may be able to bring back a draught of water to his friend. He ‘struggles ‘on for scarce a rood,’ then sinks to the ground, says his *mea culpa*, and dies. Roland soon after bends over him.

‘He took the fair white hands outspread,
 Crossed and clasped them upon his breast,
 And thus his plaint to the dead addressed—
 So did his country's law ordain :—
 “ Ah, gentleman of noble strain,
 I trust thee unto God the True,
 Whose service never man shall do
 With more devoted heart and mind,
 To guard the faith, to win mankind ;
 From the Apostles' day till now
 Such prophet never rose as thou.
 Nor pain nor torment thy soul await,
 But of Paradise the open gate ! ” ’

In vigour and pathos this poem rises to the end. There are few things in poetry more simply grand than the death of Roland. He moves feebly back to the adjoining limit-line of Spain—the land which his well-loved master has conquered—and a bow-shot beyond it, and then drops to the ground at the base of a flight of marble steps beneath a stately terrace.

‘His Durindana all bare he held,
 In front a dark brown rock arose—
 He smote upon it ten grievous blows.
 Grated the steel as struck the flint,
 Yet it brake not, nor bore its edge one dint.
 “ Mary, Mother, be thou mine aid :
 Ah, Durindana, my ill-starred blade,
 I may no longer thy guardian be ! ” ’

He smites once more on the marble steps, but the steel will not break.

‘“ Oh, fair and holy, my peerless sword,
 What relics lie in thy pommel stored !
 Fragment of holy Mary's vest—
 'Twere shame that thou with the heathen rest :
 Thee should the hand of a Christian serve,
 One who would never in battle swerve.

What regions won I with thee of yore,
The empire now of Karl the hoar !
Rich and mighty is he therefore ! ”

That death was on him he knew full well ;
Down from his head to his heart it fell.
On the grass beneath a pine-tree's shade,
With face to earth his form he laid,
Beneath him placed he his horn and sword,
And turned his face to the heathen horde.
Thus hath he done the sooth to show,
That Karl and his warriors all may know
That the gentle Count a conqueror died :
Mea culpa full oft he cried.
And for all his sins, unto God above,
In sign of penance he raised his glove.

To God's compassion he makes his cry :
“ O Father true, who canst not lie,
Who didst Lazarus raise unto life again,
And Daniel shield in the lion's den ;
Shield my soul from its peril due
For the sins I sinned my lifetime through.”

He did his right-hand glove uplift—
St. Gabriel took from his hand the gift ;
Then drooped his head upon his breast,
And with clasped hands he went to rest.
God from on high sent down to him
One of his angel cherubim—
Saint Michael of Peril of the Sea,
Saint Gabriel in company—
From heaven they came for that soul of price,
And they bore it with them to Paradise.’ (P. 176.)

The sequel may be briefly told. Charlemagne's returning army sees the Moslem host in flight, and at a distance. The Emperor prays, however ; the day is miraculously prolonged, according to the promise of ‘ his wonted angel ; ’ and before it closes the enemy is driven back on the way to Saragossa as far as the Ebro, and destroyed.

‘ Encumbered with their armour's weight,
Sank the most to the bottom, straight ;
Others floated adown the stream,
And the luckiest drank their fill I deem.’

On its bank the conqueror rests that night.

‘ In the mead the Emperor made his bed,
With his mighty spear beside his head,

Nor will he doff his arms to-night,
 But lies in his broidered hauberk white.
 Laced is his helm, with gold inlaid,
 Girt on Joyeuse, the peerless blade,
 Which changes thirty times a day
 The brightness of its varying ray.
 Nor may the lance unspoken be
 Which pierced our Saviour on the tree ;
 Karl has its point—so God him graced—
 Within his golden hilt enchased :
 And for this honour and boon of heaven
 The name, Joyeuse, to the sword was given ;
 The Franks may hold it in memory :
 Thence came “ Monjoie,” their battle-cry,
 And thence no race with them may vie.’ (P. 184.)

During the night Karl is a second time assailed by ominous visions. In the morning he marches to Roncesvalles. He finds his nephew. Roland had kept his early vow, that he

‘ Would lie with head to the foeman’s shore
 And make his end like a conqueror.’

Karl does not lament alone—

‘ The Franks bewail in unison ;
 A hundred thousand wept like one.’

The Paladins and their host are then interred.

‘ Nor prayers of bishop or abbot ceased,
 Of monk or canon, or tonsured priest.
 The dead they blessed in God’s great name,
 Set myrrh and frankincense aflaine.
 Their incense to the dead they gave,
 Then laid them, as be seemed the brave—
 What could they more ?—in an honoured grave.’

As the Emperor approaches Saragossa, Bramimonde, Marsil’s Queen, ascends its highest tower and watches the advancing crusaders. The citizens have lost all faith in their religion. They revile ‘ Apollyn,’ because he has deserted them, snatch his crown from ‘ Termagaunt,’ and fling the image of Mahomet into a trench. Not a little instructive is it to find that the Moslem law was, after the lapse of so many centuries, supposed in the West to be a form of heathen idolatry. King Marsil, who has reached his capital maimed and with the loss of his son in battle, turns his face to the wall and dies. The Queen surrenders the city,

‘ Ten great towers and fifty small.
 Well strives he whom God aids withal.’

Saragossa is somewhat unceremoniously added to the Church as well as to the Empire.

‘ The bishops have the water blessed,
The heathens to the font are pressed ; ’

and Bramimonde is carried a captive into France. Her queenly rank is respected ;

‘ And in love be her conversion wrought.’

Karl, on his homeward way, enshrines the horn of Roland on Saint Severin’s altar at Bordeaux, and entombs his body, as well as those of Olivier and Archbishop Turpin, in Saint Roman’s Sanctuary at Blaye.

At last Karl reaches Aix, his Imperial seat, and summons the magnates of all his kingdoms. As they sit around his throne an uninvited guest stands up before him. It is the sister of Olivier, and the espoused wife of Roland. The following passage is an instance of that masterly brevity which characterises the finest passages, and eminently the last part, of this poem. Alda speaks :—

“ Where is my Roland, Sire,” she cried,
“ Who vowed to take me for his bride ? ”
O’er Karl the flood of sorrow swept ;
He tore his beard, and loud he wept.
“ Dear sister, gentle friend,” he said,
“ Thou seekest one who lieth dead :
I plight to thee my son instead—
Louis, who lord of my realm shall be.”
“ Strange,” she said, “ seems this to me.
God and his angels forbid that I
Should live on earth if Roland die.”
Pale grew her cheek—she sank amain,
Down at the feet of Charlemagne.
So died she. God receive her soul !
The Franks bewail her in grief and dole.’ (P. 198.)

At Aix, on Saint Sylvester’s day, there sits a great court, and the impeachment of Ganelon begins. He scorns to deny his guilt : but it was not for gold, but in vengeance for a wrong, that he had planned the death of his haughty step-son.

“ Therein, I say, was treason none ”—
They said, “ We will advise thereon.”

Ganelon is condemned, and, when allowed the trial by single combat, his champion falls. He is torn to pieces by wild horses, and thirty of his kinsfolk, who had gone bail for him, are hanged. Queen Bramimonde abjures the Moslem law.

“ She hath harkened to sermon and homily,
And a true believer in Christ will be.
Baptize her, so that her soul have grace.” ’

Justice satisfied, it was the aged Emperor’s hope that the rest of his life might be passed in peace ; but this was not to be. The night that the Queen became a Christian, God’s angel stands beside him in a vision.

“ Karl, thou shalt summon thine empire’s host,
And march in haste to Bira’s coast ;
Unto Impha city relief to bring,
And succour Vivian, the Christian King.”

Fain would Karl such task decline.
“ God ! what a life of toil is mine ! ” ’

Notwithstanding, the Imperial servant of God fares forth upon his conquering way.

Few can read the extracts we have selected from this poem without perceiving that it is one that deserves the fame and the wide circulation it possessed for centuries before the invention of printing, when the jongleur recited it at the village festival, in the market place of the great city, and in the castle of the noble, crowded round by priests and by ladies, as well as by rude artisans in leathern jerkins. In these days, when so much has been said about poetry as an art, it is refreshing to read a poem which, while it is simplicity itself, the work evidently of one who thought of his subject, not of himself, yet reminds us, through its grace, its pathos, and its completeness, no less than through its varied power, of Shakespeare’s doctrine, ‘ There is no art, but nature makes that art.’ The poet had carefully planned what he afterwards wrote with such a glad-some spontaneity. He does not scruple to depart from the details of history where the interests of his poem require it. He represents Charlemagne as of great age when he was still in his prime, doubtless in order that he might thus stand in contrast with his heroic nephew, not in competition with him. He sustains our reverence for the great Emperor by representing him as having triumphed for seven years in Spain, and left that land only when he had completed his work, though Eginhard has left us in prose a less flattering account of that expedition. He gives a greater dignity to the catastrophe by ascribing to the whole concentrated Moslem power of Spain an overthrow which was actually effected by the Basques and Gascons of the mountains. He saves the military honour of the Franks by attributing their disaster, like that of the Greeks before

Troy, largely to internal dissension ; while at the same time he does not, like the Italian poets, make Ganelon a mercenary traitor, but a man who revenges what he deems a deadly wrong. He vindicates poetic justice by making the fall of Roland in part a penance inflicted on wrong-doing. As Mr. O'Hagan well remarks : ' He is doubly the cause of the disaster ' in which he fell ; first by his scorn of Ganelon, and, again, ' by his haughty refusal to wind his horn and apprise Charlemagne of his danger.'

Nor is this all : many and various incidents are in this poem combined within the limits of a brief narrative. There is a corresponding variety of character ; for, though all the warriors are brave, they preserve their individuality, and nothing can be less alike than the valour of Roland, which is reckless and impulsive ; that of Olivier, which is equable, severe, and tempered by prudence ; and that of the Archbishop, which is chiefly the crusader's zeal. Not less picturesque is the contrast between the wily and fitful audacity of the Moslem chiefs, alternating with their fears, as they bound upon their prey like a wild beast which, in the act of springing, looks another way, and the religious heroism of the Christians. The conclusion is also, as a matter of art, more elevated, though less sensational, than it would have been if the poem had ended with the disaster of Roncesvalles. Life has its agonies ; but, in the Christian estimate, a kindly Providence, not the merciless fate of the old Pagan drama, rules all things, leading man out of darkness into light. The poem does not end in tragedy. Those who have died nobly are honoured in their graves ; the wicked are punished ; and the last image left behind on our imagination is that of the white-haired Emperor faring forth once more in search of new triumphs for the Cross. Victory, we feel, must run, like a perpetual sunrise, before his self-sacrificing spirit. It is not wonderful if to this large and far-famed monument of mediæval literature the same specially artistic merit belongs which Coleridge attributes to the shorter poems of the Middle Ages.

But the chief merit of this poem is one which cannot be wholly supplied even by the union of nature and art. The 'form' of a poem is doubtless an important matter, and many a work of high genius has missed the prize because it sinned fatally against proportion ; but there are two things of yet higher importance, viz. its substance and its spirit. As regards the former, the 'Chanson' is fortunate indeed. It has little concern either with the lower appetites of man, or with the mere conventionalities of life : it does not make its boast of

speculations or of mystifications, and it does not vindicate its originality by affecting the eccentric or the quaint. It draws mainly from the springs of our moral and spiritual being. It takes for its subject the noblest relations of our universal humanity. Heroic courage and religious faith, patriotism, and honour, and friendship,—the dangers that tax our energies to the utmost, and the magnanimity that can look with equal eye on victory or defeat,—these are the subject of this poem. These things constitute its substance. Its spirit is worthy of the theme. That spirit is the spirit of self-sacrificing loyalty—loyalty not directed to a sovereign alone—or rather recognising a sovereign claim in whatever is the object of our dutiful reverence and love. It is not their own approaching death that the Paladins lament; their recurrent thought is still, how much their beloved Karl will grieve when he looks upon them dead. They think little of the loss to their proper fame; but they cannot forget how their ‘gentle France’ will be humbled by such a defeat. It is for Roland that Olivier grieves, and Roland for Olivier: while the warlike Archbishop will not consent to death till the Paladins are brought once more to his feet, and he can extend his arms over them, if not in a last absolution, at least in a latest prayer. It is with the love of woman as with the friendship of man. Alda is but twice named in the poem, and but once appears in it. It is to ask for her betrothed husband, and to die. She is as loyal to Roland as he is to his King and his country. To her he was both of these.

Next to the spirit of loyalty the spirit of sympathy pervades this poem. As Dante sinks to the ground at the sufferings he witnesses in his ‘Purgatorio,’ so warriors who have no pity for their own wounds swoon with grief when some loved companion in arms falls beside them;—but they do not forget to avenge him. The age described is one of vehement passions and fierce impulses: it has little benevolence outside the sphere of its sympathies; but that sphere is a wide one. It is free from that self-love which makes the love of another an unreal or a sophisticated thing; even in its enmity there is little of malice: and war, so long as it is honourable war against an honourable foe, is but a wild sport, and presupposes little of mutual hatred. In that age men seemed to dwell at once in two worlds, of which the earthlier was betrothed to the heavenlier; and while the lower one, that of human life, wore all the shifting lights and fair illusions of a poem, the world of faith, and its promises, shone out with all the vividness of reality. This, no doubt, is the fair side of a picture which had also a

darker aspect—one strangely disfigured by prejudice, intolerance, and sometimes by a deplorable indifference both as to injustice and to human suffering. The ‘*Chanson*’ gives occasional witness to these defects; but, on the whole, it is the fairer side of the age which it presents, and from which it derives its greatness and its beauty.

Our own time is an age of revivals, and has had its mediæval as well as its classical ‘*Renaissance*’; but the coat of mail does not make the knight, and the modern imitations of the chivalrous have more often represented the accidents of the feudal times than embodied their better spirit. In this respect the ‘*Song of Roland*’ has the advantage which the original ever has over the copy. It is not a mere romance of knight-errantry. It belongs to the age it describes; it speaks its native tongue; and its consistency attests its authenticity. Mr. O’Hagan has supplied something which was wanting to English literature in enriching it with this epic of the Middle Ages. Such an enterprise of song reminds us of Walter Savage Landor’s remark on translations, that, however proud poets may justly be of originality, still, to remove a pyramid from the banks of the Nile and plant it on Salisbury Plain, is a greater feat than to set up a chandler’s shop both brilliant and new.

It will interest the reader to learn that the manuscript to which France is indebted for the poem of which she is so justly proud was discovered in the Bodleian Library, to which it had been presented by Sir Kenelm Digby in 1634, and that it was never given to the world till 1837. In 1878 the entire poem was photographed, with all its contractions, lacunæ, &c., by Herr Edmond Stelgel. M. Gautier believes that the author of the ‘*Song*’ was one of the Normans who accompanied William to England; while others have ‘assumed that it was a portion of this poem which Taillefer, the jongleur, chaunted when he leaped ashore and flung his sword into the air at the beginning of the battle of Hastings.’ (P. 26.) For the evidence in favour of these statements, which every Englishman would fain believe to be true, we must refer our readers to Mr. O’Hagan’s admirable preface, several statements derived from which will be found in our pages.

ART. IV.—1. *Memoir of the Public Life of the Right Hon. John Charles Herries in the Reigns of George III., George IV., William IV., and Victoria.* By his Son, EDWARD HERRIES, C.B. With an Introduction by Sir CHARLES HERRIES, K.C.B. London: 1880.

2. *A Political Diary, 1828–1830.* By EDWARD LAW, Lord ELLENBOROUGH. Edited by Lord COLCHESTER. London: 1881.

THERE are two kinds of political memoirs which have a fair chance of surviving the temporary existence which circulating libraries give to works of this character. One class comprises the attempts, which are occasionally made with success, to throw a new or clearer light on the character and career of some prominent political person. The other class, which is perhaps of greater interest, includes the memoirs of persons—not necessarily in the front rank of politics themselves—who happened to have exceptional opportunities of ascertaining the true history of their times. A casual reader might perhaps imagine that each of the works before us fell under one or other of these categories. The memoir of Mr. Herries is an elaborate attempt to correct the account which has hitherto been accepted of Mr. Herries' conduct in the rise and fall of the Goderich Administration. Lord Ellenborough had exceptional opportunities of watching the secret history of England during the years to which his diary relates. Yet we have risen from a perusal of both books with a conviction that neither of them is likely to secure a wide circulation. So far as Mr. Herries' memoir is concerned, few people can be expected to take much interest in the not very important episode in the history of a short-lived ministry to which the book chiefly relates. Most of the information which Lord Ellenborough recorded in his diary is already familiar to us by the publication of the civil correspondence of the Duke of Wellington and the Journals of Mr. Greville.

* It would perhaps be difficult to find a greater contrast than that which is presented between the two men whose memoirs are thus before us. Lord Ellenborough was a man of genius, an orator by nature and cultivation, a brilliant writer, whose pen was ultimately to become the cause of his fall, a politician, who, when he fancied he saw by intuition, did not stop to think (*Diary*, i. 163). Mr. Herries, on the contrary, was a man of industry, who had acquired, by long experience in subordinate situations, a considerable stock of valuable in-

formation. He had no talents for debate; he had no genius for authorship. Yet the two men were destined to meet in the same Cabinet. The diary of the one forms, in some respects, a singular commentary on the memoir of the other. If Lord Ellenborough could write his colleague a civil letter, he took care to record his private thoughts in his own journal.

Lord Ellenborough's diary will remind many persons of the now well-known journal which the first Lord Colchester kept for years. Both of them are framed on the same model, though Lord Ellenborough's journal is fuller, longer, and less temperate than Lord Colchester's. But, though there is this resemblance between the diaries of the two statesmen, it ought to be recollected that there was a broad distinction between the positions they occupied. Lord Colchester began his diary as an independent member of the House of Commons; he continued it as Secretary for Ireland and Speaker; he concluded it as an independent member of the House of Lords. Lord Ellenborough's published diary, on the contrary, relates to the period during which he sat in the Wellington Cabinet. The chief interest which it possesses arises from the circumstance that the proceedings of the Cabinet are minutely recorded. So far as we are aware, no similar account by any other Cabinet minister has yet been published. The time may arrive when it may be considered desirable to introduce reporters to Downing Street, and to publish the deliberations of ministers for the benefit of their contemporaries. But, till that time arrives, and so long as the proceedings of Cabinets are understood to be secret, is it right that one of the members of a Government should record, for posthumous publication, the deliberations of his colleagues? Is such a course likely to produce free discussion or amicable feelings in the Cabinet? When we read the severe rebuke which the Duke of Wellington administered to Mr. Herries for allowing the scheme of the Ministry to be taken from his table (*Memoir*, ii. 64), we cannot help wondering what the Duke would have thought of Lord Ellenborough's journal.

It will, moreover, occur to most people that, if reporters are to be present at Cabinets, Lord Ellenborough's temperament did not qualify him for that duty. The viceroy who startled two continents by his proclamations had not the judicial calmness which is desirable in historians. A few people may be interested in knowing that Sir Robert Peel was 'captious' on one occasion and 'disagreeable' on another; that Lord Dudley was 'obstinate;' Mr. Huskisson 'untrustworthy;' Lord Palmerston 'always pecking;' Mr. Charles Grant 'use-

'less,' and Lord Aberdeen's foreign policy 'miserable.' Some other persons may care to learn that Lord Lyndhurst thought that 'we should have no cabinets after dinner. We 'all drink too much wine, and are not civil to each other;' or that, three months afterwards, Lord Lyndhurst's opinion was confirmed by the Cabinet having 'a great deal of useless talk, 'a large portion of which originated in Lord Bathurst's being 'rather drunk' (i. 76, 156). But we owe ourselves to a painful feeling that, if it be desirable to know this, it is not desirable that we should know it from Lord Ellenborough. There is an old proverb that 'it is an ill bird which fouls its own nest,' and we have yet to learn that the proverb is not true when the nest is a Cabinet, and the bird a minister.

Lord Ellenborough, on the formation of the Wellington Administration, received the office of Lord Privy Seal. In those days economists had not begun to attack a place which is now declared by them to be a useless sinecure. In Lord Ellenborough's hands, indeed, the office became anything but a sinecure. As he had no duties of his own to do, he became 'a complete letter writer' for the Cabinet. He passed much of his time in composing despatches, first for Lord Dudley and afterwards for Lord Aberdeen, on foreign affairs. It, perhaps naturally, occurred to him, while he was drafting his colleagues' despatches, that he might with advantage occupy the Foreign Office himself. 'I cannot help thinking that if Dudley and I 'were to change places the country would be no loser.' Lord Dudley resigned, and Lord Aberdeen replaced him at the Foreign Office. 'Hardinge told me "that I had ten times the "ability of Aberdeen: that I had more talent than any man "in the Cabinet."' Entries of this kind produce resentment in a reader. Just as it is painful to read the story of Cabinet quarrels in the diary of a Cabinet minister, so we should prefer to obtain evidence of Lord Ellenborough's ability from any pen but his own.

Discontented with his sinecure office, Lord Ellenborough resolved on resigning his seat in the Cabinet in the autumn of 1828. By that time, however, the Duke of Wellington was able to offer him a more suitable situation—the Presidency of the Board of Control. Lord Ellenborough had not much fancy for his new post. He longed for the Foreign Office: he would have preferred the Admiralty to India. Yet his whole career was being insensibly shaped by the position in which he was thus placed. While he was writing despatches for Lord Dudley and Lord Aberdeen, the Russians were occupying the Principalities; and Lord Ellenborough was acquiring an ad-

miration for the Turks and a profound dread of their opponents. When he succeeded to the Board of Control, he found frontier questions under discussion, which gave him a new opportunity of enforcing his views, and he expressed them in language which would have obtained a ready cheer in many places two years ago. 'I would,' he wrote, 'in Persia, and everywhere, endeavour to create the means of throwing the whole world in arms upon Russia at the first convenient time.' This country owed much to the Duke of Wellington; but we own that, till we read this passage, we did not know how much it owed to him. It is awful to reflect on the consequences which might have ensued if Lord Ellenborough had been placed in the Foreign Office in 1828.

At the first Cabinet dinner after his acceptance of office, Lord Ellenborough noticed 'a plain, ordinary, clerklike man' who, he learned, was his colleague Mr. Herries, the subject of the other memoir whose title we have prefixed to this article. The two volumes which Mr. Herries' sons have published come before us as an apology. Mr. Herries' reputation—so his sons think—has been unjustly injured by calumnious misrepresentations, first made by Lord Palmerston, and repeated by Mr. Spencer Walpole in his 'History of England.' We approach the book, therefore, with the respect due to men who are zealous in defending their father's character. Yet, at the outset, we must speak of it in terms of disparagement. The work is not well written, the matter is not well arranged. Mr. Edward Herries has given us the dry bones of biography, but he has failed to make the dry bones live.

There is one other remark on the book, as a book, which we are bound to offer before we turn to a consideration of the subject of it. Few people will, we think, read it without regretting its tone. Its success as an apology is marred by the painful sense that the authors have lost their temper. We are not now alluding to the manner in which they speak of the history which is 'the immediate cause' of the publication of these volumes. They think that Mr. Spencer Walpole, in his account of the Goderich Administration, has calumniously misrepresented Mr. Herries; and that the effect of Mr. Walpole's remarks is heightened by the circumstance that Mr. Walpole is the son of Mr. Herries' esteemed friend and colleague in the first Derby Ministry, and the grandson of Spencer Perceval, the Prime Minister, to whom Mr. Herries was private secretary. Under such circumstances their wrath with Mr. Walpole is natural. But we fail to see why the authors should have found it necessary to denounce other persons and

even nations with whom Mr. Herries has not the good fortune to agree. Is it decorous to say that the conduct of the Russian agents in 1814, when Russia was the ally of England, was 'unworthy even of a small money-changer'? (i. 90). Is it right to call Mr. Herries' opponents in 1827 (i.e. Lord Lansdowne and Mr. Tierney) 'unfair, illiberal, self-seeking, 'and overbearing'? (i. 233). Are there any grounds for thinking that Lord Palmerston's administration of the War Office was marked by 'dilatoriness and laxity' (i. 53), or that it was 'slow and slovenly'? (i. 225 note). Is it necessary to accuse the Duke of Wellington of 'a disposition to find fault 'with everything said or done' by the civilian departments? (i. 36)—to describe a passage in Sir William Napier's 'History 'of the Peninsular War' as 'an odious slander'? (i. 38)—to insinuate that Lord Palmerston's autobiography, which is published by Lord Dalling, was not written by Lord Palmerston (i. 194 note, and ii. 78 note)—or to speak of an observation of Lord Palmerston's, 'like many others left on record by' him, as having 'the defect of being untrue'? (ii. 114). We can assure Sir C. Herries and his brother that other statesmen besides their father have left relatives behind them to whom their reputation is dear; and that it will seem to most people as indecorous to impute falsehood to Lord Palmerston, forgery to Lord Dalling, or slander to Sir William Napier, as to style Mr. Herries 'a Tory clerk' or 'a creature of George IV.'

From these reflections, however, on the authors' manner, we gladly turn to their matter. John Charles Herries, the subject of the memoir, was the eldest son of Charles Herries, and nephew of Sir Robert Herries, 'the founder of the banking 'firm in St. James' Street, now known under the name of 'Herries, Farquhar, & Co.' A year after Mr. Herries' birth, his father received the command of a small corps of Light Horse Volunteers which was formed in London. The corps, which originally consisted of only fifty members, justly prided itself on the materials of which it was composed. The Duke of Montrose, Lord Manners, Lord Bexley, and Mr. Perceval belonged to it; and they all felt a warm regard for their commanding officer, Colonel Herries. Their regard was testified by very substantial proofs. In 1798, when Colonel Herries became bankrupt, the corps, which at that time consisted of 600 instead of fifty members, all, according to Lord Campbell's newly published life, men of rank, purchased for him an annuity of 1,000*l.* a year. In 1819, when he died, they gave him a public funeral in Westminster Abbey. Their regard was attended with more important consequences to his son. Mr.

John Charles Herries owed his introduction to political life, and his rapid advancement, to the men whom his father had commanded in the Light Horse Volunteers.

Colonel Herries' reduced circumstances had compelled him to accept a Treasury clerkship of 95*l.* a year for his son. Mr. John Charles Herries was thus introduced into the office in which he was ultimately destined to do excellent work. If not a genius, he had 'the capacity of taking infinite pains' which has been identified with genius. His first promotion seems to have been due to his industry. 'A vacancy occurred in the Revenue Department of the Treasury.' The work was hard, the other clerks shrank from it, and young Herries was the only applicant for it. He had, at any rate, the advantage of relief in a short period. Mr. Addington succeeded Mr. Pitt; Mr. Vansittart became Secretary to the Treasury, and selected as his private secretary the son of his commanding officer. We believe that Mr. Herries retained his post till the fall of the Tories in 1806. The accession of All the Talents to power relegated him to his desk only for a year. On the formation of the Duke of Portland's Administration, Mr. Herries was selected for further advancement. Mr. Perceval, like Mr. Vansittart, had served under Colonel Herries in the Light Horse Volunteers. He was naturally disposed to look with favour on the son of his old commanding officer. The enquiries which he made respecting him were answered so favourably, that he immediately selected him for his private secretaryship. The choice was a good one. Mr. Herries proved an excellent private secretary; he devoted himself to his chief's service; he embraced his chief's opinions; he even handed them down to his sons.

We have been recently told, on the highest authority, that 'the relations between a minister and his secretary are, or at least should be, among the finest that can subsist between two individuals;' and we have seen that even the honours of a peerage are not thought too high a reward for service of this character. In the good old days when George III. was king, ministers did not confer peerages on their private secretaries, but they gave them more substantial rewards. 'At the beginning of 1809 Mr. Herries was appointed Secretary and Registrar to the Order of the Bath, a place with a small salary and probably little business. The average annual emoluments arising from fees were trifling before the augmentation of the order, but on the occasion of the creation of a large number of Knights Grand Cross they brought in nearly 7,000*l.*' We presume that Mr. Herries means by

this passage that 7,000*l.* proved the exceptional profits of the place in a particular year, and not, as his words strictly construed would imply, that the annual emoluments were raised to an average of that sum. Yet, if the former meaning attach to the paragraph, what a picture it presents of the old system of government before the Reform Act! Could anything be more intolerable than that a minister should have been able to reward his private secretary with a place to which nominally little profit attached, but whose emoluments were raised on exceptional occasions by a sum of 7,000*l.* levied from persons, perhaps little able to afford the payment, selected for exceptional honours by the Crown?

Mr. Herries' good fortune was not, however, exhausted. In 1811 the Comptrollership of Army Accounts fell vacant, and Mr. Perceval selected Mr. Herries for the post. It appears that our authors have a strong objection to the application of the word '*intrigue*' to any negotiation in which their father was concerned, and in which he happened to have received a pledge from the king. But we may notice that on this occasion Mr. Perceval's '*intentions* were well-nigh frustrated by a '*smart intrigue*, a promise in favour of another person having '*been obtained from the Prince Regent.*' Notwithstanding the Regent's promise, Mr. Perceval had his way, but, before Mr. Herries could enter his new office, another arrangement was opened to him. In 1809 the Commissariat Department had been separated from the Treasury, and had been placed under Colonel (afterwards Sir) Willoughby Gordon. In 1811 Colonel Gordon became Quartermaster-General, and Mr. Herries was selected, on Mr. Perceval's recommendation, to succeed him. Years afterwards it was said in Parliament that Mr. Herries had hereditary claims on the English people, his father having almost originated the volunteer movement. The same principle may perhaps have given the family an hereditary claim to the Comptrollership of Army Accounts, as we believe that office was conferred some years afterwards on Colonel Sir W. Herries.

The office of Commissary-in-Chief was worth 2,700*l.* a year. It was held by Mr. Herries for five years. During these years Mr. Herries unquestionably performed excellent service. The Duke of Wellington, indeed, occasionally complained that he was not adequately supported by the civilian departments of the army, and Sir William Napier afterwards embodied the Duke's complaints in his history. The Duke's complaints were natural enough in his position. Overwhelmed with work, without adequate leisure to test the justice of all his observa-

tions, he was disposed, if his trenching tools were bad, or if his troops were without great coats, to blame the Commissary-in-Chief; though the tools had been actually bought under his own directions in the Peninsula, and the great coats had been left behind under his own orders. The Duke, in fact, lived to admit that his complaints were unfounded, and to declare that he had received 'cordial support' from the Home Government. We have no doubt that Mr. Herries, as Commissary-in-Chief, proved a capable, assiduous, and honest public servant. It is fair to add that he travelled, in his zeal, beyond the sphere of his immediate duties. In concert with Mr. Rothschild, and with the approval of the Government, he went over to the continent in 1813 to arrange a plan for the collection of specie for the use of the war. In 1814 he negotiated treaties with the allies for making the subsidies due to them payable in foreign money at Paris instead of in pounds sterling at London, and in 1815 he suggested and conducted the coinage of French louis d'or at the London Mint. It was, however, his misfortune to be perpetually misunderstood. Sir William Napier told his readers that the French louis—the work of Mr. Herries—had been coined under the Duke of Wellington's directions at St. Jean de Luz. Sir A. Alison ascribed the successes of the war and the overthrow of Napoleon to the issue of bills of credit which were never issued; and neither historian had a word of praise for the Commissary-in-Chief who was supplying great coats, examining entrenching tools, negotiating commercial treaties, and coining French money.

It is one of Mr. Edward Herries' numerous complaints that Mr. Spencer Walpole, in writing the 'History of England,' has dwelt at 'quite disproportionate length' on Mr. Herries' antecedents, and yet has suppressed all reference to his services as Commissary-in-Chief. But Mr. Walpole would probably reply that his description of Mr. Herries' antecedents is, after all, confined to six lines; and that Mr. Herries' services as Commissary-in-Chief were not universally regarded, at the time, from the standpoint from which his sons wish us to look upon them. Mr. E. Herries merely tells us that, when his father's office was abolished on the conclusion of the war, a new post—the auditorship of the Civil List—was conferred upon him, and that this appointment was made the occasion of a party attack. He omits to say that a substantial salary, 1,500*l.*, was attached to the new appointment; that Mr. Herries received also a retiring pension of 1,350*l.*, reduced only while he held office to 1,200*l.* a year; that the Opposition bitterly inveighed against the gross extravagance of these arrange-

ments; that they declared that the merit of reorganising the Commissariat had been due to Sir W. Gordon and not to Mr. Herries; and that they protested against this gentleman receiving in future 1,200*l.* for doing nothing, and 1,500*l.* for doing very little. We have no desire to rake out of Hansard all the hard things which were said of Mr. Herries. But, as his sons complain of what they call Mr. Walpole's *suppressio veri*, we have a right to expect that they, at any rate, will not omit one half the story from their narrative. If we were disposed to judge this book by their own lofty standard, it might be said of such an omission: 'This is not ignorance. It is not negligence. It is bad faith, such as even in a party pamphlet would be intolerable' (i. 112). But experience in such matters makes us refrain from using hard words; and we are neither indignant, nor even surprised, at the omission from Mr. Herries' narrative of the case against his father.

For the next few years Mr. Herries continued to receive his 1,200*l.* a year for doing nothing, and his 1,500*l.* a year for doing very little. In the beginning of 1823, however, Lord Liverpool, after the reconstruction of his government, offered one of the joint secretaryships of the Treasury to Mr. Herries, accompanying the offer by suggesting that he should enter Parliament as member for Harwich, a seat which had become vacant on Mr. Vansittart's promotion to the peerage. Mr. Herries accepted Lord Liverpool's offer, and remained one of the joint Secretaries to the Treasury for the next four or five years. Mr. Edward Herries tells us that Lord Liverpool's reliance on his judgment was so great, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer's 'carelessness' so marked, that Mr. Herries exercised an authority 'much greater in extent and degree than that which belonged to many a Cabinet minister.' We have no doubt that Mr. Herries made an excellent Secretary to the Treasury. His knowledge of financial details and his desire to retrench qualified him for the post. After four years' service he wished for promotion to higher office. His friend, Mr. Vansittart, had been raised from the Secretaryship of the Treasury to the Chancellorship of the Exchequer. Mr. Herries knew, at any rate, as much about finance as Mr. Vansittart; he enjoyed the confidence of the King, and he had faithfully served his party. The changes necessary on the death of Lord Liverpool in 1827 apparently afforded an opportunity for promoting his wishes. For one year he became the pivot on which the internal history of England frequently turned. The light which the present memoir throws on the inner history of this year is not great, but it is the only

circumstance which will commend it to the student of history.

The principal features of the history of this country in 1827 are accurately known. Our authors think that, in some essential particulars, they have corrected the account which has usually been given of these events. They seem to us, on the contrary, to have confirmed it. In the April which succeeded Lord Liverpool's illness, Mr. Canning was instructed to form a government. The leaders of the Tory party declined to act under his guidance, and, with few exceptions, seceded from the Ministry. Mr. Herries, like Sidney Wilton in '*Endymion*,' declined to follow the example of his immediate leader, and retained his post. His conduct in doing so was tolerated rather than approved by the Tories. Mr. Peel wished him to resign, but the other leaders of the party admitted that there were 'valid grounds for your remaining in office rather than be the cause of embarrassment in your particular department to the King's Government' (i. 137). As they were doing everything to embarrass Mr. Canning's Administration, it is obvious that they must have used the phrase 'the King's Government' as a synonym for the King.

Mr. Herries, however, was not anxious to remain in his old office. Towards the end of April, before the formation of Mr. Canning's Government was complete, he proposed, in consequence of a conversation with Lord Goderich, that he should be made First Commissioner of Woods and Forests, an office which frequently conferred a seat in the Cabinet on its holder. Lord Goderich, in suggesting the arrangement, told Mr. Herries that 'it would be agreeable to the King' (i. 124). Mr. Canning, however, did not adopt the suggestion, and Mr. Herries remained at the Treasury. But, in the beginning of July, experiencing 'a gradual failure of health and strength,' he asked Mr. Canning to 'confer on some other person an office which' he was 'physically unable to discharge satisfactorily,' suggesting, however, that he might still undertake the easier labour of the Vice-Presidency of the Board of Trade or the First Commissionership of Woods. Mr. Canning was either unable or unwilling to comply with Mr. Herries' wish, and Mr. Herries immediately afterwards took a step which cannot be reconciled with the reasons which he had alleged for desiring a change of office. He had complained that his health was failing, and that he was unequal to his work, and he voluntarily accepted more work. A commission had been appointed in 1824 to supervise the restorations which were being effected at Windsor, and Mr. Herries was placed on the com-

mission. Lord Goderich, Lord Farnborough, and Mr. Herries, the three commissioners on whom the work chiefly fell, evidently desirous of promoting the King's wishes, travelled out of the sphere of their immediate duties into the entire question of Civil List expenditure, and Mr. Herries himself, at the end of July, asked Sir William Knighton to meet them on the subject of furnishing Windsor Castle, *and also on some other matters connected with Civil List expenditure.*

Three things, then, seem clear from the memoir before us: 1. The Tories tolerated Mr. Herries' continuance at the Treasury, because they thought his resignation would be a source of embarrassment to the King. 2. Lord Goderich suggested Mr. Herries' promotion to the Woods and Forests because he thought it would be agreeable to the King. 3. Mr. Herries, at the end of July, was in communication with Sir William Knighton on arrangements for furnishing Windsor and on the whole Civil List expenditure of the King. To complete the picture which is thus afforded by the memoir before us, we must now allude to evidence which may be obtained in other quarters. Immediately on being directed to form a Ministry, Mr. Canning offered Lord Palmerston the Chancellorship of the Exchequer. Lord Palmerston, at that time, represented in Parliament the University of Cambridge. The other member for the University, Sir John Copley, was promoted to the Chancellorship, and a sharp contest was expected to take place for the vacant seat. Afraid of being drawn into this contest, Lord Palmerston decided, on Mr. Croker's advice, to defer entering upon his new office till after the close of the Session.

'In the meanwhile,' to quote the language of his autobiography, 'intrigues were set on foot. George IV., who personally hated me, did not fancy me as Chancellor of the Exchequer. He wanted to have Herries in that office. There were questions coming on about palaces and crown lands which the King was very anxious about; and he wished to have either a creature of his own at the Exchequer, or to have the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer held by the First Lord, whose numerous occupations would compel him to leave details very much to George Harrison, the Secretary, and to Herries, auditor of the Civil List.'

About the middle of the Session, to complete Lord Palmerston's account, Mr. Canning told him that he felt himself unable to carry out the intended arrangement, as 'the financial department' of the Treasury—of which it must be recollected Mr. Herries was the chief—thought it 'extremely important that the First Lord should be Chancellor of the Ex-

‘chequer.’ Lord Palmerston received the announcement with admirable good humour, and Mr. Canning seemed much relieved by the interview. During the remainder of the Session, however, he sent twice for Lord Palmerston—the first time to make to him, by the King’s command, the ridiculous or insulting offer of the Governorship of Jamaica, which ‘the King’ said he knew and was sure was just the very thing I should ‘like;’ the second time to propose to him, in a manner which did himself as much honour as it did Lord Palmerston, that he should assume the Governor-Generalship of India.

Such is the account which has hitherto been accepted on Lord Palmerston’s authority. Mr. Edward Herries asks us to reject the story, and even ventures to doubt the genuineness of the autobiography. The grounds on which we are asked to disbelieve Lord Palmerston or his biographer are threefold. In the first place, Lord Palmerston asserts that ‘George IV. wanted to have Herries in the Exchequer;’ and Mr. Herries can find no trace in his father’s correspondence of such a wish, and can recollect no allusion to it in his father’s conversation. But this circumstance does not shake Lord Palmerston’s story. Lord Palmerston was a Cabinet minister. Mr. Herries was outside the Cabinet. Lord Palmerston must have known many things which were not known to Mr. Herries, and there is no reason why he should not have known that George IV. desired Mr. Herries’ promotion. We decline, therefore, on the negative testimony of Mr. Herries, to disbelieve the positive assertion of Lord Palmerston. But, in the next place, our author triumphantly points to an inaccuracy in Lord Palmerston’s account. He calls Mr. Herries Auditor of the Civil List, and Mr. Herries had resigned the auditorship of the Civil List four years before; he could not in fact have held the post with his seat in Parliament, and even if he had held it questions about ‘palaces and crown lands’ would not have come before him. Technically, no doubt, Lord Palmerston’s narrative is inaccurate. He ought to have called George Harrison Assistant Secretary, and not Secretary, to the Treasury, and Herries late Auditor, and not Auditor, of the Civil List. But those who can raise their minds from technical quibbling to principles will be disposed to think that Mr. Herries’ memoir is the strongest justification of Lord Palmerston’s expression. We know, now for the first time, that Mr. Herries in 1827 was wishing to confer with the King’s private secretary on the subject of furnishing Windsor Palace, and on some other matters connected with Civil List expenditure. If he was not still Auditor of the Civil List, he was

at any rate dealing with the Civil List expenditure. What can be more natural, under such circumstances, than for a busy man like Lord Palmerston to have named Mr. Herries by the title of his old office, whose duties he was still consulted on, instead of styling him by that of his new one ?

Our author, however, has a third reason for rejecting Lord Palmerston's story. It seems that, while Lord Palmerston's appointment to the Chancellorship of the Exchequer was pending, Mr. Canning asked Mr. Herries whether he would consent to serve as Secretary to the Treasury under Lord Palmerston, and that the enquiry was answered with a decided negative. Whereupon the Prime Minister observed : ' Then let us say no more about it ' (i. 129). But this story, so far as it goes, confirms Lord Palmerston's account. The King was objecting to his appointment ; Mr. Herries was tendering his resignation. Under such circumstances it was obviously unnecessary to contemplate Mr. Herries serving under Lord Palmerston, and the best thing for Mr. Canning to do was to say nothing about it.

We have now reached the close of the first chapter in a complicated negotiation. We have already seen that the Tories tolerated Mr. Herries' continuance at the Treasury, because they thought his resignation would be a source of embarrassment to the King ; that Lord Goderich had suggested Mr. Herries' promotion to the Woods and Forests, because he thought it would be agreeable to the King ; and that Mr. Herries, at the end of July, was in communication with Sir William Knighton on arrangements for furnishing Windsor, and on the whole Civil List expenditure. To this we are now able to add that the department of the Treasury which Mr. Herries represented had opposed Lord Palmerston's appointment, and that Mr. Herries had personally refused to serve under Lord Palmerston, and, by doing so, had supported the King's wishes. Whether these considerations justify Lord Palmerston in implying that Mr. Herries was a creature of George IV. is a matter of opinion. Whether Mr. Spencer Walpole, in writing the history of the period, should have quoted and adopted the phrase, is a matter of taste. But, justifiable or unjustifiable, the reasons for the phrase have undoubtedly been strengthened by the publication of the memoir. Before it appeared, it was possible to infer that Mr. Herries' relations with the King were agreeable. It has been reserved to his sons to prove that the Tory party thought their father a necessity to George IV.

On Wednesday, August 8, 1827, Mr. Canning died. On

the same day Lord Westmoreland wrote to the Duke of Wellington that 'Lord Goderich was appointed minister. There were talks of Herries being Chancellor of the Exchequer.' The talk seems to have been tolerably general. Mr. Planta, who was joint secretary of the Treasury with Mr. Herries, thought that his colleague would be called upon to be Chancellor of the Exchequer; and Lord Lyndhurst, who led the Tory section in the Cabinet, wrote to Mr. Herries and begged him to defer starting on a contemplated foreign tour. Mr. E. Herries makes a great point of Lord Lyndhurst's letter to his father. But it seems to us to weigh, if it has any weight, against his own version of the story. If the King had desired for months Mr. Herries' promotion to the Exchequer, his Majesty's wishes must necessarily have been known to Lord Lyndhurst. The Chancellor would naturally have desired to please the King, and, at the same time, to strengthen his own following in the Cabinet. Both reasons would have induced him to support Mr. Herries' promotion and to urge his deferring a foreign tour. If, then, Lord Lyndhurst's short note has any importance at all, it shows that the Chancellor was cognisant of the King's wishes respecting Mr. Herries. On the day after Mr. Canning's death the Cabinet met, and a letter from the King was received, containing his general views on the reconstruction of the Ministry. On the preceding day he had seen Lord Goderich and Mr. Sturges Bourne, and had personally proposed to the latter that he should assume the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer. The proposal, however, was not repeated in the King's note which was laid before the Cabinet, and seems to have dropped through. But active negotiations were at once set on foot for the disposal of the office. Lord Palmerston, whose account has been followed by Mr. Spencer Walpole, writes in his autobiography: 'On Canning's death Goderich was appointed First Lord of the Treasury, and he immediately requested me to be his Chancellor of the Exchequer. I accepted.' Mr. Herries, whose narrative of the transaction is now published for the first time, says that on the Saturday (an evident error for Sunday) which followed Mr. Canning's death he received a letter from Mr. Planta telling him that Lord Goderich wished to see him on the following day; that he had no doubt that the Chancellorship of the Exchequer would be offered to him, and that he knew on undoubted authority that the King wished the arrangement. On the following day (Monday, August 13), Mr. Herries accordingly came up to London. But, instead of driving to Downing Street to see the Prime Minister, he went

first to Lincoln's Inn to see the Chancellor. Lord Lyndhurst told him that 'the King desired him to convey to me his own particular wish that I should accept the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, which Lord Goderich would offer me.' The Prime Minister, whom Mr. Herries saw later in the day, repeated the offer in almost the same terms: 'He told me that the King desired I would undertake the office, and come to him to-morrow morning to kiss hands.' Mr. Herries, however, was in bad health; he saw the difficulties with which the new Ministry would have to grapple, and he hesitated to accept the post. 'The discomforts of a very bad night' increased his desire to refuse it; and consequently, instead of going to Windsor on the Tuesday to kiss hands, he wrote to Lord Goderich to decline the office. He addressed to Lord Goderich two letters. One, for the King's eye, began: 'Your communication of the King's most gracious condescension in desiring you to propose to me to fill the important office of Chancellor of the Exchequer was gratifying to me in a degree which I cannot attempt to express.' The other, for Lord Goderich's eye, requested the Prime Minister to communicate to the King 'my helpless and comfortless condition, disqualifying me for the task which the King, *by your advice* (judging far too favourably of my abilities), has proposed that I should undertake.' It is, to say the least, singular that the mention of the Prime Minister's advice should have been reserved for the eye of the Prime Minister alone.

On the morning of Tuesday, August 14, Mr. Herries had definitely declined the Chancellorship of the Exchequer. Lord Goderich, free to make other arrangements, offered the place, on August 15, to Lord Palmerston. But the King was, in the meanwhile, despatching his private secretary, Sir William Knighton, to London, with the object of inducing Mr. Herries to reconsider his refusal. On Wednesday morning, August 15, Mr. Herries felt himself compelled to declare that he would do his best to meet his Majesty's wishes. But he had hardly despatched this message to Windsor before Lord Goderich again called upon him. Lord Goderich was, of course, embarrassed by Mr. Herries' new decision. After some conversation, it was apparently arranged that Mr. Herries should be put into some other office; and Lord Goderich accordingly wrote to the King, recommending Lord Palmerston for the Chancellorship of the Exchequer, and Mr. Herries as Lord Palmerston's successor at the War Office. Instead of adopting his Minister's advice, the King wrote a letter to Mr. Herries—which he sent through Lord Goderich—desiring

him to come to Windsor on Friday, as he could not dispense with Mr. Herries' services as his Chancellor of the Exchequer. Perplexed by this new embarrassment, Lord Goderich, on the morning of August 16, explained to Lord Palmerston that a difficulty had arisen about the Chancellorship of the Exchequer, and that the King insisted on its being given to Mr. Herries. He told Mr. Herries in the evening that the King desired his attendance at Windsor on the following day; but obtained a promise from him that he would advise his Majesty to 'desist from his present intentions, and to think no more of me.' At this interview, however, Lord Goderich omitted to hand his colleague the letter in which the King declared that he could not dispense with his services. He was probably in hopes of inducing his Majesty to withdraw a command which he should have never penned without the consent of his Minister. The King, however, did not withdraw his letter, and Lord Goderich on the following morning was compelled to produce it. Mr. Herries, almost as ignorant of the principles of the Constitution as the King, declared that it was impossible to offer any further resistance. Lord Goderich, as weak as the King was obstinate, agreed that Mr. Herries had no alternative, and that he must accept the office. Mr. Herries accordingly went down to Windsor for the purpose. Then was enacted the strange scene which bewildered Mr. Greville, and which even Lord Palmerston only imperfectly understood. While the Ministers were actually waiting for the King, the Whig members of the Cabinet objected to Mr. Herries' appointment. Lord Goderich, unable to reconcile the contrary wishes of his colleagues and his Sovereign, begged Mr. Herries to help him out of his difficulty by declining the seals. Mr. Herries, however, refused to do anything of the kind. He had come to Windsor, with reluctance, to accept the seals, and, if the King offered them to him, he intended to take them. After interviews with several of his ministers, the King was at last induced to defer Mr. Herries' appointment until after Mr. Huskisson's return from the continent. 'But remember,' he said as he parted from him, 'the seals are for you—they are yours.'

Mr. Huskisson did not return from the continent until the evening of August 28, and, in the meanwhile, fresh heat had been imported into the discussion. 'A paragraph was sent to the newspapers'—we are quoting from Mr. Spencer Walpole's 'History of England'—'to explain that the appointment had not been definitely made.'

'For a few days "Courier," "Post," "Times," "New Times," "Sun,"

and "Herald" inserted their little paragraphs in praise of the Minister designate. The funds, it was stated, fell on the mere rumour that Herries had declined the office; the city recovered its complacency on a report that he had accepted it. . . . The praise was probably overdone; the reaction was suddenly coming. Towards the end of August a newspaper suddenly hinted that Herries was connected with a great capitalist, the arbiter of the European exchanges. The "Chronicle" immediately denounced the connexion, and declared that it disqualified Herries for the Exchequer. The "Courier" contradicted the "Chronicle;" the "Chronicle" replied to the "Courier;" and for a week people thought of nothing but the acquaintance of Herries with Rothschild.'

The paragraph represents accurately enough the war of words which took place between the date of the Council and Mr. Huskisson's return from abroad. Whether it should have been inserted by Mr. Walpole is another matter. Mr. Edward Herries thinks that Mr. Walpole is guilty of sins of commission and omission in printing it: sins of commission, because he has reproduced a slander which Mr. Herries' friends thought should have been punished by a prosecution at the time at which it first appeared; sins of omission, because he has omitted to explain the nature of Mr. Herries' connexion with the Rothschilds, and to insert a contradiction which was given on Lord Goderich's authority to the imputation in the 'Times.' We must leave Mr. Edward Herries to settle this little quarrel with Mr. Walpole; and we will only observe that, if Mr. Walpole has offended against the laws of taste by inserting the charge, Mr. Herries' sons have taken an adequate revenge by accusing Mr. Walpole of calumny and slander.

Mr. Huskisson, who had been made arbiter in the matter, reached England on August 28. He blamed Lord Palmerston, according to the latter's autobiography, for not having stood out. If he had 'insisted upon the fulfilment of Goderich's 'promise, that promise would not have been retracted, especially 'as it was spontaneously made.' According to Mr. Greville, who was better informed than most ministers, Mr. Huskisson 'went to the King, and spoke to him openly and firmly on the 'subject of Mr. Herries' appointment;' and he adds that the king consented that another arrangement should be made. On the other hand, according to Mr. Herries, Huskisson viewed the subject in its proper light—in other words, took Mr. Herries' side of the quarrel. Amidst these discordant opinions it is satisfactory to find an agreement upon one point. Mr. Huskisson, at any rate, did his best to obtain the transfer of Mr. Herries to another office, and the appointment of Mr. Sturges Bourne to the Exchequer. Mr. Sturges Bourne, however,

refused the post, Mr. Huskisson also declined it, and the King, in Mr. Spencer Walpole's words, thereupon fell back upon Mr. Herries. We will not apply to him the phrase which Mr. Walpole has borrowed from Lord Palmerston, and call him 'a creature' of the King; but there can be no doubt that Lord Palmerston was accurate in styling him the King's Chancellor of the Exchequer and not Goderich's.

The King was undoubtedly the person whose conduct throughout this episode was most objectionable. In forcing Mr. Herries on his ministry, in sending his commands through the Chancellor and his private secretary, and in declining to attend to the remonstrances of Lord Goderich and Lord Lansdowne, he played the part of an autocratic and not of a constitutional sovereign. Some people may perhaps think that his conduct was almost as unwise as it was unconstitutional. The motives which induced him to insist on Mr. Herries' presence at the Exchequer seem, at first sight, wholly inadequate. Mr. Spencer Walpole, indeed, says that 'the King, intent on building palaces in London . . . was anxious to have a creature 'of his own at the Exchequer.' But Mr. Edward Herries indignantly replies that Buckingham Palace was approaching completion, that no other palace was being constructed, and that Mr. Walpole's charge is therefore an 'idle tale.' Mr. Edward Herries should make his researches a little deeper before he ventures on confident contradictions of this kind. Had he studied with care the proper authorities, he would have found that, up to August 1827, Parliament had received no intimation that the works at Buckingham House would not be completed for the original estimate of 252,690*l*. In 1828, however, a Select Committee discovered that the expense already incurred exceeded 400,000*l*. In 1829, the estimates were formally raised to 496,000*l*.; and in 1831, after the commencement of a new reign, the cost had risen to 613,000*l*. Much of this expense had been forced on the architect, Mr. Nash, by the King himself; the progress of the excess was concealed from the Treasury; but, in the words of a Select Committee of the House of Commons, 'the successive governments, who originated and authorised this heavy expenditure of public money, 'did not use sufficient caution.'

Excessive expenditure was not the only scandal connected with the erection of Buckingham Palace. Parliament originally proposed that the works should be paid for out of the surplus land revenues of the Crown. But these revenues were diverted to other uses; and the palace works would necessarily have been stopped if some other funds had not been

made available for the purpose. In 1816, however, France had been compelled to pay a large compensation for the losses which British subjects had incurred during the war, and the Treasury, on four separate occasions, applied to the palace works sums amounting in the aggregate to 250,000*l.* out of the surplus of this indemnity. The first of these irregular payments was made in March, 1826; the last of them on June 26, 1827. None of these improper transactions were communicated to Parliament, and they seem to have been first discovered by a Committee appointed in 1828 to enquire into the condition of the public buildings. The revelation naturally created much sensation, and is referred to by Lord Ellenborough in his Diary. Lord Ellenborough evidently understood the discreditable nature of the transaction, and expressed his satisfaction that the Duke of Wellington had had nothing to do with it (Diary, i. 93).

It is clear, therefore, that George IV. was 'intent' on pushing on the works at Buckingham Palace; that his architect was concealing from the Treasury the cost which he was incurring; and that the Ministry was misappropriating funds for the purpose. The blame of these misappropriations must primarily rest with Lord Liverpool, Lord Goderich, and Mr. Canning. But Mr. Herries was Financial Secretary of the Treasury when they were made; he must have been cognisant of them; and the King may naturally have desired to retain him at the Treasury, and prevent the introduction of some less compliant adviser. The seeming difficulty, therefore, of explaining George IV.'s motives for forcing Mr. Herries on his Ministers is thus removed, and the reasons for his reprehensible conduct become plain. If, however, the King's conduct was especially reprehensible, it is fair to recollect that nothing but Lord Goderich's weakness made it possible. Lord Goderich ought undoubtedly to have resigned his office rather than have acceded to the King's unconstitutional demands. His neglect to do so made him technically responsible for the whole of the circumstances, and debars us from feeling any compassion for him in the subsequent difficulties in which he was involved. We wish we could add that the whole responsibility rested with the King and Lord Goderich. But it is impossible to avoid contrasting the conduct of Lord Palmerston with the policy of Mr. Herries. Whatever else may be doubtful, it is at least certain that Lord Palmerston generously relieved Lord Goderich from a promise which was a source of embarrassment to his chief. It is equally certain that Mr. Herries declined to terminate the difficulty by refusing an office which his col-

leagues did not desire him to accept. It is a good thing in politics as well as in private life to recollect that, where the right course seems doubtful, it is usually safe to take the road which, on personal grounds, seems least expedient. If Mr. Herries had adopted this rule in 1827, he would have saved himself much mortification, his colleagues many embarrassments, and his sons the pain of seeing their father called a creature of the King.

At the beginning of September 1827, however, the Cabinet was nominally complete, and for rather more than two months nothing occurred to imperil its existence. But in the previous Session Mr. Herries had suggested, and Mr. Canning had agreed, that a Select Committee should be appointed in 1828 to consider the financial condition of the country. Mr. Herries evidently desired to occupy the chair of this Committee. The Whig members of the Cabinet, on the contrary, wished to exclude him from the chair and to place Lord Althorp in it. During November Mr. Tierney persuaded Mr. Huskisson and Lord Goderich to assent to this arrangement, and received their authority to sound Lord Spencer on the subject of his son's assuming the post. Oddly enough, the three ministers omitted to consult Mr. Herries himself on the point. Mr. Herries naturally resented their omission to do so. The Finance Committee was 'his own child'; he was responsible for the finance of the country; and it was impossible for him to allow a step involving important financial consequences to be taken without his approval or knowledge. He remonstrated; Mr. Huskisson admitted that he was to blame, and wrote to Mr. Tierney to stop further negotiations with respect to the composition of the Committee till 'nearer to the time of meeting Parliament.' It was, in fact, absolutely necessary to stop any such negotiations. Steps were actually in progress for the reconstruction of the Cabinet by the admission of Lord Holland and Lord Wellesley to it. No one had thought it necessary to consult 'the King's Chancellor of the Exchequer' about the chairmanship of the Finance Committee. No one thought it necessary to speak to him about the reconstruction of the Cabinet. The first which he heard of the matter was that the negotiation had failed, and that Lord Goderich had consequently resigned office. Under such circumstances it was useless to think about the chairmanship of the Finance Committee. After a few days' suspense, however, Lord Goderich was persuaded to resume his post, and Mr. Herries almost immediately wrote to him respecting the Committee. Poor Lord Goderich then discovered that he was in a new dilemma. Mr.

Herries virtually refused to remain in office if Lord Althorp were placed in the chair of the Committee; Mr. Huskisson insisted on resigning if Lord Althorp were not appointed to it. Had Lord Goderich been a stronger man, he would probably have relieved himself of Mr. Herries' presence in the Cabinet, and insisted on the admission of Lord Holland and Lord Wellesley to it. He had no nerve, however, for such a course, and, instead of it, hastened to the King to state his difficulties and receive his dismissal. George IV. sent for the Duke of Wellington, and the Goderich Administration was dissolved.

It is obvious from this summary that the immediate cause of the downfall of the Ministry was the quarrel between Mr. Huskisson and Mr. Herries on the chairmanship of the Finance Committee. The cause was stated clearly enough by Lord Goderich in the House of Lords. 'There was,' he said, 'an irreconcilable difference between two of my colleagues. I found—painfully found—that I could not bring them together. I could not induce either of them to vary his resolution.' Lord Goderich's declaration ought to have been decisive. Mr. Herries, however, was apparently unwilling to admit that his own refusal to place Lord Althorp in the chair of a Select Committee had broken up the Government. A week after Lord Goderich's speech, he gave his own account of the matter in the House of Commons.

'I say that circumstances were known before the date of my letter to those connected with the Government, which made them foresee the dissolution that was about to take place. I further say that this letter and proceeding of mine was taken advantage of as a convenient opportunity for doing that which sooner or later must have happened. I say that I know it was so taken advantage of. I say that I know it has been discussed whether my letter should not be made use of in the manner it has been. There is one other subject to which I wish to call the attention of the House. It has been stated in some of the public papers that I have held communication on the subject with the very highest personage in the State. Now I declare upon my word of honour as a gentleman, and as I hope to be saved, that I have never had any communication with any individual on the question out of the circle of my own colleagues. Nor did I, on my word of honour, make the least communication in the high quarter alluded to.'

Emphatic language of this kind naturally created a profound sensation. The late Lord Clarendon, who happened to be present, wrote to Mr. Herries to congratulate him on the favourable impression which his explanation had produced. Mr. Edward Herries prints Lord Clarendon's letter as decisive evidence in his father's favour.' We are sorry to dispel

the illusion, but we are bound to add that the favourable impression soon disappeared. The Opposition naturally declared that if Mr. Herries knew, as he said he knew, of a plot or cabal—as they called it—to destroy the Government, he was bound to reveal it; and Mr. Herries was forced to confess that his emphatic ‘I know’ only meant ‘I believe.’ The night afterwards Lord Goderich positively denied the whole story, and two nights later on Mr. Herries, ‘at bay against a throng ‘of fierce assailants,’ refused, in his son’s language, to enter into any further explanations, and confined himself to the reiterated expression of the conviction which he entertained (ii. 69). Mr. Edward Herries seems incapable of realising the position of his father and his father’s critics. They demanded proof of the knowledge which he professed to possess, and he had nothing to state but his own convictions. One of them, indeed, had the dexterity to ask him whether, if he had consulted no one, anyone had consulted him, and Mr. Herries declined to answer the question.

‘The impression left with regard to Herries is as unfavourable as possible,’ wrote Mr. Greville in his diary. Hardinge ‘tells me,’ wrote Lord Ellenborough, ‘he was damaged and the House against him.’ (Diary, i. 38.) We fear that Mr. Edward Herries will be unable to shake the conclusion which was thus expressed by Sir H. Hardinge and Mr. Greville. He is, indeed, able to publish a paper which his father left behind him, in which he solemnly repeats that his determination was adopted by his own judgment and conviction alone, uninfluenced by advice, suggestion, or communication from any quarter whatsoever (ii. 77). We have every desire to respect Mr. Herries’ assurance, as the word of an honest man; but his posthumous explanation leaves the matter in an unsatisfactory condition. If it is conclusive, why should Mr. Herries have refused to give it in the House? But it is plain that it does not meet the question which was raised in the House. Mr. Herries was not asked whether he had been influenced by anyone’s advice, but whether he had been consulted by anyone. Mr. Edward Herries must forgive us for saying that his father’s denial of one question does not necessarily imply that he denied the other.

The point is of importance from Mr. Herries’ point of view on account of an expression used by Lord Palmerston in his autobiography. Lord Palmerston says that Mr. Huskisson told him that ‘Herries had been thrown like a live shell into the Cabinet to explode and blow us all up. At the appointed time,’ Lord Palmerston goes on to say, ‘he did explode; he

‘picked a quarrel with Huskisson,’ &c. Lord Palmerston’s words certainly mean, if they are construed strictly, that Mr. Herries blew up the Cabinet at the time at which the King—who had thrust him into it—desired that it should explode. If Lord Palmerston really did mean this, he implied little more than Mr. Tierney, who complained in the House of Commons that Mr. Herries had said nothing in the Cabinet respecting his objections to Lord Althorp’s appointment, and had left the Cabinet to put them in writing. ‘It looked just as if he had agreed to bolster up the Government at night that he might blow it up the next morning.’ Lord Palmerston, of course, may have shared the opinion which Mr. Tierney deliberately expressed. Mr. Edward Herries, however, thinks that, if Lord Palmerston had believed the story, he could not have sat in the Wellington Cabinet with a man whom he deemed guilty of such ‘odious treachery,’ and that, if he had not believed it, he would not have left recorded for posthumous publication a monstrous accusation against a dead man. He therefore insinuates that Lord Palmerston never wrote the autobiography at all. On that point we think that we may be able to reassure Mr. Herries. Through the favour of Lord Palmerston’s representatives, we have had the opportunity of inspecting his autobiography, and there is no doubt whatever of its genuineness. The reasons which led to its composition, we may add, are told in Mr. Evelyn Ashley’s life of Lord Palmerston, and Mr. Herries will see that it is to the last degree unlikely that Lord Dalling should have seen the document until after Lord Palmerston’s death. There can be no doubt, then, that Lord Palmerston did write the phrase which Mr. Herries thinks objectionable. But it does not at all follow that he intended to attach to it the offensive meaning which it perhaps bears, if strictly construed. When St. Paul says that the heir is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father, he, of course, only means that the lad is under restraint until he comes of age. In the same way Lord Palmerston probably means that it is the nature of shells to explode; that, if they are placed in an inflammable atmosphere, they are tolerably certain to explode; and that Mr. Herries—a shell under these conditions—did explode in due course.

After the downfall of the Goderich Administration the Duke of Wellington succeeded in forming a ministry. Mr. Huskisson consented to remain in office ‘on condition that Mr. Herries should not continue to hold the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer;’ and Mr. Herries, unaware of ‘Mr.

‘Huskisson’s stipulation,’ unwisely, as his son thinks, accepted the Mastership of the Mint (ii. 59). ‘The part of the transaction,’ wrote Mr. Greville at the time, ‘which will appear extraordinary is that, the Government having been broken up by a quarrel between Huskisson and Herries, the opposite party come in, and both these ministers remain with them.’

Every interest in Mr. Herries’ career ceased with the formation of the Wellington Administration. Once, indeed, on a later occasion, at the period of Mr. Huskisson’s retirement, the King formally suggested to the Duke of Wellington that Mr. Herries should return to the Exchequer; and Mr. Herries, three days afterwards, himself proposed his own removal to a situation of labour and responsibility (ii. 88). But this renewed joint action on the part of Mr. Herries and his Sovereign did not lead to a fresh dilemma. The Duke pointed out the objections to the arrangement, softening his refusal by a graceful acknowledgment of Mr. Herries’ abilities. George IV. did not venture on replying to his new minister; and Mr. Herries continued to draw the 2,000*l.* a year which his ‘mere sinecure’ afforded him, without renewing his application for removal to another office.

Mr. Herries, of course, fell with his party in the autumn of 1830, and reverted to his comfortable pension as Commissary-in-Chief. In 1835, during the few months of Sir Robert Peel’s first administration, he filled the office of Secretary at War; in 1841 he had the misfortune to lose his seat at Harwich; and his absence from Parliament prevented Sir Robert Peel from including him in his second administration; in 1852, in the first Derby Ministry, he filled the office of President of the Board of Control.

We have now referred to the leading incidents in the public life of Mr. Herries. The task is, for many reasons, an ungrateful one. It seems ungenerous to find fault with a meritorious public servant who, after faithfully discharging subordinate duties, was promoted to a sphere which he was not strong enough to fill. We would much rather praise the excellent service which Mr. Herries discharged up to 1826, than criticise the part which he played in 1827. On this point, however, we have no alternative. Mr. Herries’ sons have thought fit to demand a verdict on their father’s conduct in 1827. They, not we, have stated the issue. They, not we, are responsible for the judgment. And what is our judgment? We do not know that we can express our own opinion more accurately than by citing the exact words which were used in these columns more than fifty years ago.

‘Mr. Herries, a gentleman utterly unknown to the country and to Parliament, except in the subordinate situations of private secretary to Secretaries of the Treasury and Chancellors of the Exchequer, had been elevated to the place of a Commissary-General, afterwards of Auditor of the Civil List, and lastly had attained the height of his natural career by being made a Secretary to the Treasury. All at once it is said that the necessity of making him Chancellor of the Exchequer was felt, and he was made Chancellor of the Exchequer. Without power, rank, talents for debate, influence of any kind, personally or through his connexions.’*

Mr. Edward Herries has, of course, written two volumes to induce posterity to form a contrary conclusion. We respect him for doing so, but we cannot alter our judgment. It is a common saying that no one is a hero to his valet, but we may at least hope that every one is a hero to his sons. This country has produced few financiers, but it has at any rate seen many Ministers of Finance; and we have no doubt that the sons of all the finance ministers who left children were impressed with the capacity which their own fathers displayed at the Exchequer. Mr. Edward Herries quotes two pieces of evidence to prove his father’s superiority. The first is a letter from Lord Brougham: ‘A. Baring, afterwards Ashburton, said you were, of all the men he had ever seen in the financial department—and I think he added transacted business with—by far the most competent.’ The second is an opinion ‘manifested more than once to a permanent public servant of high rank (on whose authority we state the fact) by (then) Lord John Russell, who declared that, as he believed, Mr. Herries knew more of the finances of this country than any other man in England’ (ii. 277, 278). We will not comment on the obvious fact that both these pieces of testimony are merely hearsay evidence, and reject them on that ground. It is easy to meet them on their merits. It is utterly impossible that either Lord Ashburton or Lord John Russell could have intended to compare Mr. Herries with Sir Robert Peel or Mr. Gladstone. It is evident, therefore, that the competence and knowledge which they were thinking of were the competence and knowledge required in the subordinate advisers of a minister, and not the competence and knowledge required in a financier. They prove that good judges admitted, as we ourselves admit, that Mr. Herries did excellent subaltern service; they do not prove that he was fitted for the situation of Chancellor of the Exchequer.

* *Edinburgh Review*, vol. xlvii. p. 255.

There are, indeed, only three things in the whole of the memoir before us, which would entitle Mr. Herries to a more favourable verdict. The first is that he advocated retrenchment in 1816; the second, that he was apparently in favour of imposing an income-tax in 1828; the third, that he gave really useful assistance to Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Goulburn in 1841. On the first point he deserves infinite credit. But retrenchment, at the time, was advocated by the whole Whig party. We cannot admit that the Whig party consisted of Chancellors of the Exchequer in embryo; and Mr. Herries' views, therefore, though they prove his good sense, do not prove his financial superiority. His disposition to revert to a property-tax in 1828 is a high proof of his sagacity. But Lord Althorp was undoubtedly gravitating to the same opinion; and Lord Althorp, in Mr. Herries' judgment—a judgment which we emphatically repudiate—was 'the very worst of the financial managers who have had charge of the Exchequer' (ii. 209). Again, the friendly part which Mr. Herries played towards Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Goulburn in 1841 does not affect our judgment. It seems that he found the two ministers, who had urgently summoned him, in difficulty about a financial operation.

'It did not appear to the person called in that the embarrassment, which, in his opinion, might have been avoided, was a very serious one, and he suggested means for its removal. Then ensued a curious incident. The two heads of the Treasury, closeted with a great capitalist, discussed the terms of a proposed arrangement, while in an adjoining room their concealed counsellor [Mr. Herries] sat apart for occasional consultation.' (ii. 105.)

But this story exactly confirms our own conclusion that Mr. Herries was an excellent adviser; it does not prove that he was a competent finance minister. All statesmen are forced to rely on persons below them for technical information which they do not possess themselves; but it does not consequently follow that the minister should change places with his advisers. We have no doubt that one of the authors of this very memoir has frequently given important assistance to Mr. Gladstone; but, with all respect for Sir Charles Herries, we cannot think that he should supplant Mr. Gladstone at the Exchequer. In the same way, we have no doubt that his long experience had given Mr. Herries a knowledge of financial details which Sir Robert Peel did not possess; but we do not consequently think that Mr. Herries was as competent a financier as Sir Robert Peel.

But there are two other facts which, at first sight, seem

so weighty, that we have reserved them for the last. On April 19, 1829, Lord Ellenborough wrote to Mr. Herries:—

‘Our Indian finances are in a bad state, and very much require your experienced hand to bring them round. . . . We must find a remedy, and none will be found until we can place one strong and practised mind at the head of the whole finance of the empire. . . . If you should be inclined to look at the office as one which you might possibly undertake, I am disposed to think that I should have no great difficulty in inducing the Directors to make it worth your while to go to India.’ (ii. 106.)

Mr. Herries wrote to refuse the appointment, and Lord Ellenborough then replied:—

‘I should hardly venture to think of creating the office I spoke to you of unless I was certain of being able to place you in it, for I know no other man I think fit.’ (ii. 108.)

We are not surprised at the confidence with which Mr. Edward Herries produces this piece of evidence in his father’s favour. We own that when we read Lord Ellenborough’s opinion, we were almost induced to reconsider our own. But Mr. Edward Herries is the most unfortunate of authors. He no sooner produces Lord Ellenborough’s letter than Lord Colchester publishes Lord Ellenborough’s diary; and we find that exactly one week before Mr. Herries was asked to reorganise the finances of India as the only fit man, he was thought of for the Governorship of Bombay. But we will quote the two extracts from the diary, dated respectively the 12th and 16th of April, 1829:—

‘The Chancellor approved highly of my notion of suggesting Herries for the government of Bombay, if the Directors will not have Courtney. *He is useless to us, and a discredit. Besides, we want his place.*’ (ii. 12.)

‘After the Cabinet I asked the Duke whether he still wished me to press Courtney upon the Directors. He said yes, he very much wanted his place. I said it had occurred to me that Herries might take the Governorship of Bombay. It did not seem to have occurred to him. He said he thought Herries would not go; *but he evidently thought it would be a very good thing if he would.*’ (ii. 19.)

Mr. Edward Herries thinks that Lord Palmerston was guilty of ‘odious treachery’ for calling his father a shell which exploded at the appointed time. We wonder whether we shall ever know his opinion of Lord Ellenborough.

We are almost ashamed, after this story, to refer to the remnant of evidence in favour of Mr. Herries’ financial ability. Mr. Hart Davis, ‘a great commercial notability’ and member for Bristol, wrote to him on November 26, 1827, that the ‘great

‘stockholders put all their trust in you, and I can assure you with truth that they would not at this moment hold any English stock if you were not the Chancellor of the Exchequer’ (ii. 2). We cannot, of course, tell whether these great stockholders all sold their stock six weeks afterwards when Mr. Herries ceased to be Chancellor of the Exchequer. But we observe that the funds, which ought to have fallen on his resignation, were higher in January 1828 than in December 1827.

We have now finished our estimate of Mr. Herries’ career. We cannot admit that he was a great financier, or that Lord Palmerston was in error in styling him ‘the King’s Chancellor of the Exchequer and not Goderich’s.’ But we gladly allow that in many situations he proved himself a capable public servant and an honest man. He is not the first, and probably will not be the last, example of the truth of Voltaire’s aphorism—

‘Tel brille au second rang qui s’éclipse au premier.’

ART. V.—1. *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Conservancy Boards, &c.* Session 1877.

2. *Report from the Select Committee (of the House of Commons) on Thames Floods Prevention.* 1877.

3. *Report from the Select Committee on Thames River (Prevention of Floods) Bill.* 1877.

4. *Water and Water Supply, chiefly in reference to the British Islands.* By Professor O. T. ANSTED. London: 1878.

5. *Rain: How, when, where, why, it is measured.* By G. J. SYMONS. London: 1867.

THE damage recently caused, on the low-lying lands of many of the river valleys of England, by heavy floods, is justly regarded as intolerable. The evil, indeed, is by no means new; but it is not one to which use reconciles the country. On the contrary, the effect of each recurrence of disastrous flood is cumulative. As regards the individual sufferers, their health is often permanently impaired, and their power of resistance to the diseases that damp brings in its train is ultimately broken down. As regards the land, the long presence of undrained flood water turns rich pastures into hungry swamps, destroying all the finer grasses, which are replaced by semi-aquatic weeds. And as regards the rivers themselves, each neglected flood erodes the banks, and piles up fresh obstacles in

the channels. The question is therefore extremely urgent, 'What is to be done?'

In the present state of the law it is impossible, in most cases, for any individual or association of individuals to take any effective action in the matter. On this point the evidence brought before the Committees of both Houses of Parliament is conclusive. During the Parliamentary Session of the year 1877 three Committees, on the subject of Floods and the Conservancy of Rivers, were sitting at the same time. The minutes of evidence taken before these three Committees, while marked by the desultory character attendant on this method of enquiry, contain a vast body of information. Landed proprietors, millowners, clerks of the peace, members of various local boards, and other persons variously interested in the conservancy of rivers, were examined. An attempt at anything like an abstract of this evidence would far exceed the space at our command. But it is not difficult to point out, in comparatively few words, the main points established by general consent, and also those features of the case which may be regarded as yet open to discussion.

It should be observed that the Committee of which Mr. Grant Duff was the chairman, though it made no report, was the only one of the three which enjoyed the advantage of having a definite proposal before it. In the other cases much of the time of the eminent men who formed the Committees was wasted by the casual method of examination, which is unavoidable when a public enquiry is commenced without any properly prepared report or programme to serve as a guide to the information required. Such enquiries may be compared to what would take place in a court of law if cases were brought up for trial without pleadings, and without briefs for counsel. On the other hand it is to be observed that the enquiry before this Committee, though one of great local importance, especially from a ratepayer's point of view, was not calculated to throw much light on the subject of inland floods, the evidence being confined to the limits of the tidal portion of the Thames. The endeavours of the opponents of the Bill were directed either to prevent the incidence of rates for the improvement of the river banks on their clients, or to show that the works of the Metropolitan Board of Works had tended to raise the high-water level of the river, and thus to increase the damage caused to great part of South London by inundation.

All that concerns our present purpose, with regard to this long and unsettled contention, is this : It is unquestionable that all rivers are subject to continual change. There is no such

thing as permanence in their condition, any more than there is stagnation in their waters. If wisely and duly tended, they improve; if neglected, they deteriorate. In the tidal portions of rivers, improvement of the channel has the effect of increasing the tidal range, making the high water higher, and the low water lower, than before. This action is going on in the Thames. Owing to the removal of old London Bridge, the dredging away of shoals by the Thames Conservancy, the embankment of the river in different places, and the removal of other obstacles, there has been, for the last forty odd years, a continuous increase in the tidal range of the river, not only in the port of London, but as high up as Teddington. 'The mean low water of the entire year,' writes Mr. Redman, M.I.C.E., in a paper contributed to the Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers in 1879,

'is now one inch lower than any analysis made for forty-five years, and the high water of the entire year is now nearly three inches higher than any year prior to 1875. . . . On January 21, 1878, the tide ebbed down to 23 feet 2 inches below Trinity high water, or lower than was ever before recorded. . . . Abnormal tides, due to westerly gales during the equinoxes, with heavy land-floods, have attained to four feet, and 4 feet 6 inches, above that datum, or nine inches in excess of any previously recorded.'*

The simple reply, then, to the complaint that the embankments of the metropolitan work have increased the inundations of the Thames, is, that these embankments form a part of that series of works which have improved, and are still improving, the navigation of the Thames. It is idle to discuss the question of distributing the share of the effect produced among the different works of improvement. Our object should be to add to what has been already done all that is still demanded for the safety of the metropolis.

With regard to the other two enquiries, the first result of the evidence, with hardly a dissentient voice, is to the effect that legislation is absolutely necessary for the protection of our river valleys from floods. The second point established is the necessity of unity of control for each watershed district. 'Your Committee,' reports the House of Commons Committee of 1877,

'consider it essential that whatever body may at any time have

* Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers, vol. lix. p. 286. Since the above was written the flood tide of the Thames has risen, on January 18 last, to the height of five feet above Trinity high-water mark.

authority over any portion of the Thames, for the purposes of drainage and the prevention of floods, should also have control over the tributaries falling into it, for the same purposes, over such distances as the circumstances may require.'

'The Committee,' are the words of the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords,

'find that almost all the witnesses examined by them are of opinion that, in order to secure uniformity and completeness of action in dealing with each river, each catchment area should, as a general rule, be placed under a single body of conservators, who should be responsible for maintaining the river, from its source to its outfall, in an efficient state, and in this view the Committee entirely concur. . . . Owing to the existence of several distinct authorities for the course of a single river, conflicts have arisen which are fatal to the adoption of any uniform and comprehensive scheme for the conservancy of the river as a whole; and there is, moreover, an absence of responsibility, which may be held to account, in great measure, for the present neglected state of several important streams.

'The difficulties which private legislation has placed in the way of any public system of conservancy are many and grave. It has been stated to the Committee that there are between 2,000 and 3,000 private Acts now in operation which relate to drainage, navigation, and matters of a similar kind; and the interests of the several persons, or bodies of persons, in whose behalf these Acts were passed, are frequently found to conflict with the due exercise of the powers granted under the public Acts above referred to.'

The third point, which results from the unanimous testimony of all the professional men whose advice has been sought, is referred to in the Report of the House of Lords Committee in the words: 'Rivers are found to differ so widely in their characteristics that in the opinion of the Committee it would be impracticable to prescribe any general scheme of conservancy which would be applicable to all rivers without exception.' This paragraph almost repeats the words of Sir John Hawkshaw: 'You cannot give opinions upon these questions without investigation. Every river has its own peculiar *régime*, and they all vary. There is no method of treating rivers which applies to every river.' In other words, a proper hydrographic survey of the entire basin of each river and its tributaries is a necessary preliminary for attempting with success any work whatever even of improvement.

The only points of primary interest with regard to the general scheme to be adopted for this conservancy that are left open by the reports before us are therefore those relating to the constitution of the several Conservancy Boards, the powers of rating, and the area over which the rating, for conservancy

purposes, ought to extend. As to the latter, the limits suggested by the evidence are, on the one hand, the successful treatment of great areas of fen country, where the whole of the district drained, whether upland or lowland, has contributed to the expense; and on the other hand the statement that, in matters submitted to the vote of vestries or small local bodies, every expense, of any kind, and for any purpose, would be resisted. Into this portion of the subject we do not propose to enter, and that from the conviction that the first requirement of the country is the acquisition of *hydrographic information* on which all wise action must be based. When the surveys of the river basins are completed, the best arrangement of boards and sub-boards will to a great extent be indicated by engineering considerations.

A deputation of unusual importance had an interview in November last with the President of the Local Government Board on the subject of floods. The Duke of Bedford introduced the deputation. The Speaker of the House of Commons described the deputation as 'representing pretty well 'every watershed in the kingdom.' While personally most interested in the county of Cambridge and the levels, Mr. Brand truly remarked that the inhabitants of every watershed in the kingdom are directly interested in the matter. Mr. Magniac, M.P. for the county of Bedford, spoke of the frightful damage recently committed by the floods in that part of England; life, health, and property, to an enormous and incalculable extent, were, he said, at stake. He had endeavoured to form an estimate of the value of the crops lost during last summer, and the figures had so staggered and frightened him that he did not like to give them, for fear of being charged with exaggeration. He knew of tens of thousands of acres that were under water. He knew one farmer who had not seen a large portion of his farm, owing to submergence by flood, for two years, although he had to pay rent for it notwithstanding—'a condition of things that must 'break the back of many small occupiers who had been 'similarly affected.' Mr. Palmer, Q.C., member for Lincoln, said that his district had suffered more than almost any other part of the country. Mr. Coote, of Huntingdon, spoke of the ravages committed by floods during the last three years in the valley of the Ouse (the Cambridgeshire river of that name), which, with the Witham, the Welland, the Nen, the Stour, and the Blackwater, drains more than a tenth part of the surface of England and Wales. In that valley alone the keep of 30,000 cattle had been destroyed. Its fertility had been

permanently deteriorated by the continual presence of flood water, which had destroyed the finer grasses of the meadows, and replaced them by coarse aquatic weeds. In the town of Huntingdon the death-rate had nearly doubled. In many of the villages in the district people had been obliged to live during the whole of last summer in the upper rooms of their houses, and to be provisioned by boats. The unfortunate occupiers of land had nothing left to them but a legacy of disease to their cattle, and the destruction of their own health, happiness, and comfort. The Mayor of Salford and Mr. Johnson (representing Nottingham) pointed out that when corporations were enabled to protect themselves by dealing with floods in their own districts they only did so by increasing the evil for those below them. Other speakers dwelt upon the impossibility of bringing various local interests into harmony, and the necessity that the legislation to be effected should be such as to enable general action to be taken for entire districts—a matter that was shown to be as necessary from an administrative as from an engineering point of view.

While thoroughly agreeing with the members of this most respectable deputation as to the necessity of Government interference in the matter, we are unable fully to support the position that the floods of the last few years are altogether unprecedented in their rise. We find unquestionable evidence of the reduction of the flood line in the lower Severn valley by two feet in consequence of the improvements effected between 1841 and 1860. As to the enormous advantages secured to many parts of the fen districts by the works on the Witham and the Nene there can be no doubt, although these improvements are not now very recent. But what has been most unexpected to ourselves is the evidence that in the Thames valley there was a higher flood on December 17, 1821, than any since recorded, and that the next highest, that of November 18, 1852, was three inches higher than the great flood of January 11, 1877. These measurements are taken from a paper handed in to the House of Commons Committee (presided over by Mr. Coope) by Mr. Taylor, and are taken from observations of flood marks at Staines, made by two separate observers; they do not, however, give the heights of floods in 1878 and 1879, the two years of heaviest rainfall ever yet recorded in England. In 1821 the height reached by the Thames above its bank at Staines was 7 feet, in 1823 it was 6 feet 9 inches, and in 1824 5 feet 9 inches. Since 1868 the height of 4 feet has been twice reached, on January 10, 1869, and January 27, 1872. It has been exceeded on

November 18, 1875, on December 9, 1876, and on January 11, 1877 (the last date of which we have the particulars), being 5 feet 8 inches on the first, 4 feet 8 inches on the second, and 5 feet 9 inches on the third of these dates. Before 1868 the rises above 4 feet, in addition to those we have cited, were, 5 feet 8 inches on January 19, 1828 ; 5 feet in February 1831 ; 5 feet 7 inches on December 4, 1841 ; 4 feet 10 inches on October 31, 1848 ; 6 feet on November 18, 1852 ; 4 feet 3 inches on January 17, 1866 ; and 4 feet 4 inches on March 28, 1867. It is, of course, quite possible that the later floods may have been longer in their duration than was formerly the case. As to that, evidence is wanting ; but the testimony given as to the deterioration of the river, due to the loss of income caused by the abstraction of river traffic by the railway companies, gives good ground to suppose that such may have been the case. As to positive height of flood, however, it will be seen that it has not been so formidable, as far as recorded, in the present decade as it was sixty years ago. This fact, as well as the contradictory opinions that are held by persons familiar with the subject as to the effect of land drainage in increasing the rapidity of floods, forms, however, but another proof of the great importance of proper observations of the height of the river and of the volume of its flow. And we have to observe that Mr. Curtis's record of only two floods in 1875, namely, on January 25 and on November 18, by no means tallies with either the dates or the rainfall quantities given in the six charts of Mr. Symons for the same year.* It is true that the latter gentleman states that nearly the whole of the land flooded at the end of October remained so until the latter part of November. Most of the rivers of central England were fuller than usual, Mr. Symons says, on October 18, when another heavy downpour of rain commenced, falling, on the 19th and 20th, over the whole of England and Wales to an average depth of two inches. Yet we have no record of flood at Staines in that year, except those of January and November. The absolute necessity of co-ordinating observations of rainfall with those of floods becomes very obvious from the comparison of these two registers kept by independent observers.

This is very clearly illustrated by comparing the flood heights above cited with the diagram of 'Fluctuations in the 'Fall of Rain from 1726 to 1865' contained in a diagram in a little book called 'Rain,' by Mr. G. J. Symons, published in 1867. The heaviest rainfall there shown is that of the year

* Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers, vol. xlv. p. 1.

1852, which was 38 per cent. above the mean. This accords with a flood rise of six feet at Staines. But 1872, in which the rainfall was 36 per cent. above the mean, has only a flood rise of four feet recorded; and 1851, a dry year, with 12 per cent. below the mean rainfall, yet witnessed a flood three feet deep at Staines. On the other hand, since the above was written, the Severn has risen to the unprecedented height of sixteen feet at Shrewsbury, and the Chairman of the Great Northern Railway has stated that two miles of that line were submerged to a depth of four feet, and remained for four months closed to traffic. These discrepancies show the absolute necessity of numerous records of observation. We now know little more than the fact that the six years, 1875–1880, have been the wettest, both individually and consecutively, ever known in England, the aggregate rainfall for the entire period having been 25 per cent. above the mean volume.

One of the first points which, as it seems to us, ought to occur to the statesman, when a demand for legislation on a subject so deeply affecting the health and welfare of so large a proportion of the inhabitants of the country is urged upon his notice, is the fact that England is not the only country that is subject to injury from floods. The annual rainfall of England is very moderate, ranging, in ordinary years, from a little over twenty-four inches, in the valley of the Thames, to a little over forty-six inches in the valleys of the Usk and the Towey. Our rivers are but modest rivulets compared with those of many parts of Europe. The Thames, the longest of them, with a course of 225 miles, not very much less than that of the Adige, has a mean volume of flow of only a tenth of the volume of that river. But the mean flow of the Adige is only an eighth part of that of the Po. And the Po, in its turn, has only one-fifth of the volume of the Danube, which great European river is thus equal in its mean discharge to 400 rivers each of the size of the Thames. The contrast between the utter ignorance of the volumes of our rivers, in their lowest, their average, and their highest condition, in which, up to this time, we have been contented to abide, becomes almost incredible when compared with the exact knowledge of the hydrology of the respective countries which is readily accessible in France, in Italy, or in Austria. ‘When ‘rain falls,’ said M. Georges Lemoine in a paper contributed to the British Association in 1878,

‘the height of the floods which it will cause in the rivers of the watershed is at once determined by the depth of rainfall. It is the duty of the State to give warning of this height, whenever it is serious. For

the Seine and its principal affluents this problem has been solved in a manner that is almost definitive. This result is due to the very complete observations which were organised, owing to the care of M. Belgrand, by the Administration of the *Ponts et Chaussées*, in 1854. Since 1855 they have been annually published. M. Belgrand has given warning of the floods of the Seine, at Paris three days, and at Mantes four days, in advance.'

The height of the great flood of 1866 was thus announced beforehand to within six inches, and that of 1876 to within two inches, of the actual rise. This last flood rose twenty-two feet on the hydrometer of the Pont d'Austerlitz in Paris; and the area submerged, only between Paris and Mantes, was 6,450 acres. Owing to the warnings given not a life was lost, and the cattle were placed in safety.

Prevision of this kind is only possible as the result of complete and well-combined observations. But there is a minor kind of prevision at which it is possible to arrive by very simple means, and the result of which would be attended with great advantage in many cases, and notably in the case of the metropolis. By the erection of hydrometers, or river gauges, at properly selected points in the course of a river, and the record of the heights attained by the water, on each hydrometer, from day to day, it would be possible in a comparatively short time to ascertain the curve of the surface of the river.* Thus, when a certain height was attained at one point, it would be easy to give immediate warning, by telegraph, to the residents at such other parts of the river as would be endangered, of the corresponding height which, after a given interval of time, the river would attain in their vicinity. This would be of signal service in the case of those parts of London which are now liable to be overflowed by the rise of the Thames, whenever an easterly wind coincides with an equinoctial spring tide. If an hydrometer were erected at Sheerness, or in such a position near the mouth of the Thames as should be indicated by practical experience, and the height of the flood tide watched whenever it was likely to threaten London, it would be easy to gain $1\frac{1}{2}$ hour's warning of the exact height that would be probably attained at London Bridge, or at any point on the river marked by an hydrometer.† If an overflowing tide were on its way up the

* These instruments may be rendered self-registering.

† On April 17, 1877, in an E.N.E. gale, high water in the port of London rose 6 feet 11 inches above high-water level at Sheerness. See Minutes of Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers, vol. lix. p. 286.

river, it would thus be quite possible to take timely precautions at those spots where the banks are defective.

The admirable state of scientific knowledge which has been attained with reference to the volume and movement of the river Seine is of comparatively recent date. In 1846, and again in 1852, great floods ravaged the valley of the Loire. So serious was the calamity in the latter year, that the Emperor of the French personally visited the locality, in company with M. Rouher, the Minister of Public Works; and on July 19 addressed to that minister a long letter on the subject, a translation of which was published in the 'Times' newspaper on July 23, 1856. 'As to a general system,' wrote the Emperor, 'to be adopted in order to protect for the future 'from such terrible scourges our rich valleys traversed by large 'rivers, that is still wanting, and must be absolutely and immediately found.' Word for word that statement may be repeated at this moment as applicable to our river valleys in England.

'At the present time,' the letter proceeds to remark, 'every 'one calls for a dyke, being satisfied with diverting the water 'from himself, and throwing it on his neighbour.' The letter then goes on to discuss at some length the subject of dykes, referring especially to the great dyke of Pinay, constructed in 1711, which in October 1855 supported the waters of the Loire at a height of seventy feet above their ordinary level, and saved Roanne from complete disaster. It may be remarked here that numerous projects for the establishment of storage basins were brought forward after the publication of this letter, one of which, proposed by M. Couroy, contemplated the establishment of eighty-eight store-lakes on the Loire and its affluents. One of these basins was commenced in 1861 on the Furens, an affluent of the Loire, near St. Etienne; but before the completion of the work its destiny was altered, and the water, which was retained by a bank fifty-four feet high, was applied as a motive force. Signor Lombardini, the great Italian hydrographer, remarked in his memoir, published in 1858, on the then recent floods of the Loire, that the basins proposed in the valleys of that river and of its affluent the Allier would have cost 2,600,000*l.* to store an aggregate quantity of 520,000,000 metric tons of water, and that the total effect of such a withdrawal of the supply would only be the lowering, at the point of junction of the two streams, of the Allier by 2·30 feet, and of the Loire by 3·30 feet. This practical comment on a portion of the suggestions of the Em-

peror's letter, however, only adds more force to its concluding paragraphs.

'Lastly, I wish that, as already exists for some, the management of the great rivers should be confided to one person, in order that the direction may be unique and prompt in the moment of danger. I wish that the engineers who have acquired long experience in matters connected with rivers should be advanced on the spot, and not suddenly taken from their particular works; for it frequently happens that an engineer who has devoted a part of his life either to the study of maritime works on the sea-coast, or to hydraulic works in the interior, is suddenly, by being promoted, employed on another service, and the State loses the advantage of his special knowledge and the result of his long practical experience. What happened after the great inundation of 1846 should serve as a lesson for us. Much was said on the subject in the Chambers, and very luminous reports were made, but no system was adopted, no clearly defined impulse given. Partial works only were executed, which, according to the opinion of scientific men, only tended, in consequence of their want of *ensemble*, to render the effects of the last scourge more disastrous.'

The wisdom of these remarks is as conspicuous as is their applicability to the condition of the river valleys of England, with the one significant exception, that no 'luminous reports' on their state have been called for by the English Government.*

Although it is anticipating the discussion of the important question of the causes of the increased impediments afforded to the escape of the flood waters of the English rivers, it may be well here to refer to the latest information afforded by the Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers as to the progress of hydrographic knowledge in France.

On November 4, 1878, the Minister of Public Works deposited at the Bureau of the Chamber of Deputies a draft Bill, providing for the systematising and improving the internal navigation of France. The Bill thus recommended, which is now law, provides for the classification and the improvement of the entire network of the internal water communication of France. It authorises the expenditure of 11,680,000*l.* on the improvement of existing water ways, of 16,800,000*l.* on the

* In addition to the nearly complete organisation of the observations of the hydrology of the basin of the Seine, M. Belgrand has sought to introduce the same system into the rest of France, and has published a considerable number of important data for the period, from 1872 to 1876, in the '*Bulletin Météorologique de l'Association Scientifique.*' Efforts have been made in the same direction, for the Saône by M. Fournet, for the Meuse by M. Poincaré, for the Loire by Messrs. Couroy, Collin, and Sainjon, and for the Garonne by M. Gros.

construction of new ones, and of an undetermined sum, which brings the probable total up to 40,000,000*l.*, on the purchase of six lines of canal; as to which the unjustifiable error, the report states, had been committed of allowing them to fall into the hands of the railway companies. The point to which we have more especially to call attention is the state of the hydrographic knowledge of the water ways of France which is indicated by the projects for this vast system of inland navigation as brought before the Legislature. In each of the reports as to the several river basins included in this magnificent scheme, which have been admirably drawn up by M. Krantz, a member of the National Assembly, 'the characteristic elements of the water courses' are distinctly tabulated. These tables comprise the designation of localities; the distances, measured by the waterway; the altitudes of the different points above the sea; the volumes of discharge, in the droughts and in the highest known floods; and the proportion of low-water to high-water volume. No such table is now known to exist with reference to a single river in the United Kingdom. M. Georges Lemoine remarks with justice: 'En Angleterre les observations, croyons-nous, manquent complètement.'

Nor is Italy, the cradle of the great engineering works of Roman times, in spite of her extreme youth as a united kingdom, behind France in her acquisition of that knowledge of her own hydrography which lies at the basis of national wealth and safety.

'In the year 1872 great floods occurred in the river Po. The banks of the stream were broken through in many places, and a very large area of country suffered heavy damage. The Italian Government, with a view to prevent the recurrence of similar disasters, appointed, by royal decree of February 16, 1873, a commission composed of seven members, all of whom were men of the first distinction as hydraulic authorities, with instructions to prepare a complete survey of the basin of the river, in order to arrive at a decision as to the most appropriate measures to prevent future mischief of the kind.'*

If the Italian Government in 1872, or the French Government in 1856, instead of adopting the only rational plan of seeking the advice of the most competent scientific authorities as to the mode of dealing with a scientific question, had referred the investigation to parliamentary committees, none of the members of whom could by any chance have any accurate knowledge of what was required, of what questions were proper

to put, or of the proper persons to whom to put them, the devastations of the Po and the Adige, the Loire and the Saône, would no doubt be at this moment causing as much helpless misery as those of the Thames, the Trent, the Ouse, and the Witham.

The first result of the appointment of the Italian Commission was the preparation of a complete section of the general course of the Po, together with its principal affluents and branches, which was completed towards the end of 1874. The venerable Senator Lombardini, who is called the Nestor of Italian hydraulic engineers, was appointed honorary president of the Commission. The surveys were executed by the civil engineers of the respective provinces traversed by the rivers in question, assisted by youths detached from the 'Schools of Application.'

'The entire course of the Po was levelled on each bank. Where embankments existed the level of the crown of the embankments was taken; in other places the natural banks of the river were indicated as accurately as possible. A number of permanent bench-marks were made, so as to render the result of the work permanently useful to the country. Cross sections of the river were taken at the same time, and referred to the distances, which are progressively numbered in kilometres. The sections show, besides the bench-marks, the crests of the banks, the levels of the meadows, the bottom of the channel, the lowest water levels in summer, and the mean and maximum depths of the river. The base line is taken as 32·81 feet below the mean sea level of the hydrometer of Porto Levante. The length of the section on the right bank is 350 miles and 600 yards, that on the left bank is 349 miles and 441 yards. The observations include (1) a topographical survey of the basin of the Po, on the scale of $\frac{1}{400000}$; (2) a plan of the river course, showing banks and shores, on a scale of $\frac{1}{30000}$; (3) sections of the branches and mouths of the river, and of the principal embanked affluents, as far as the influence of the back-water of the Po is felt; (4) main section of the river, on the scale of $\frac{1}{40000}$ longitudinal and $\frac{1}{4000}$ vertical; (5) eighty-nine cross sections, taken between Pavia and the sea, across the embanked part of the course of the river; and (6) above two hundred diagrams of the daily observations made on the principal hydrometers existing along the embanked portion of the river.'

We have transcribed the abstract which the highest professional authority in this country has published of this important work, as showing, more distinctly than could otherwise be easily done, exactly what are the first steps to be taken in any intelligent mode of dealing with the question of floods. And it must be observed that the prevention, or rather the regulation, of floods, is only one part of that necessary hydrological supervision which must be enforced by any wise legis-

lation as to either water supply, irrigation, drainage, sewerage, river purification, or inland navigation. These are not so much separate questions, each of great national importance, as separate branches of the same great question.

There is but one thing in which this hydrographic survey of the Po is deficient, namely, in a class of observations in which, owing to the energy and perseverance of one man, Mr. G. J. Symons, and his unpaid assistants, this country is unusually rich; we mean the observations of rainfall. The co-ordination of the measurement of the quantity of rain with that of the heights of the rivers, as indicated by the hydrometers, is the last link in this great chain of physical enquiry, and is a step that it is essential to take in order to attain such power of prediction as has been verified in the valley of the Seine.

A section of the course of the Bolognese Reno was made by the engineer Brighenti in 1840, and one of the course of the Arno by the engineer Manetti in 1850. An historical study of the most remarkable floods of the Po was made by the Chevalier Gallizia in 1878.* During the present century there has been, on an average, a serious flood every four years; but no less than 262 rises above the point of danger marked on the hydrometer at Pontelagoscuro have been recorded since the erection of that instrument in 1807. The six years 1801, 1839, 1806, 1857, 1868, and 1872, are those which have witnessed the most abundant and disastrous floods of the Po. Of all these the most rapid in its rise occurred in October, 1857, when the river rose more than 24 feet in vertical height at Ostiglia. This flood owed its origin to the rivers and torrents of the Apennines, especially the Tanaro and the Sesia, which then attained the greatest height on record. On the other hand, the concurrent floods of the Lombard lakes were moderate. The Lago di Como rose 4·75 feet, and the Lago di Garda 2·70 feet only. But the Lago Maggiore rose 13 feet, with an extraordinary rise of 4·30 feet in twenty-four hours, on the 22nd—a phenomenon without parallel in that basin. In the provinces of Cuneo and of Turin the rivers rose with unwonted fury. The height above the danger-signal at Pontelagoscuro was 9·76 feet, and the rise at Ostiglia was 26·80 feet. In the upper provinces of Pavia, Lodi, and Piacenza, more than twenty breaches of the banks occurred, extending for an aggregate length of a mile and a half. Intelligence of the flood was sent down the course of the river by telegraph; and the care of Lombardini was thus rewarded

* *Giornale del Genio Civile*, an. xvi. p. 3.

by the preservation of the river banks in the Mantuan and Ferrarese districts, although they were overflowed to the height of nearly two feet. In the inundation of 1872 the floods commenced in October, in which month thirty-three breaches opened in the banks of the river, and the consequent inundation was not reduced until the April of the following year.

From his study of the records of the floods of the Po, Signor Gallizia arrives at the conclusion that the progressive rise of the waters is a subject for grave anxiety. The observations at the hydrometer at Pontelagoscuro show that the height and outflow of the Po are annually increasing. The lowest *magra*, or summer drought, was in 1817, when the level of the water was 17.70 feet below the point of danger. The greatest recorded discharge was in 1872. Among the causes of the increase of floods the most effective is admitted to be the destruction of woods and forests on the hills. The improvements in agriculture, leading to a more rapid drainage, and the progress of the works of embankment on the river itself, as allowing increased rapidity of flow, also tend to raise the floods, especially in the lower reaches of the river. But on the Po, as on the Rhône, the Saône, and wherever the question has been investigated, it is to the destruction of cover, of wood, copse, thicket, or any kind of tree shelter, that the increased fury of the floods is mainly to be attributed.

The magnitude of the problem of the efficient control of the Po (justly styled by Virgil *rex fluviorum*, as far as the Italian peninsula is concerned) is presented in a very striking light by the statement of those few main elements of which we before spoke as tabulated for the French rivers. It issues from its cradle on Monte Viso at an altitude of 6,440 feet above the sea. It flows through a course of 460 miles, draining a mountain area of upwards of 15,000 square miles, and a valley surface of 26,000 square miles more. The lowest flow is 214 metric tons of water per second, the mean flow 1,720 metric tons, the flood 7,000 metric tons, or within seven per cent. of that of the Nile.

It is not this great river alone, however, that has engaged the provident and intelligent care of the Government of Italy. Five years ago, at the Geographical International Congress held at Paris, Commander Baccarini, Director-General of Hydraulic Works in Italy, read a report on the water system of that kingdom,* which gave an abstract of a mass of valuable information collected, up to that time, by

* Le Acque e le trasformazioni idrografiche in Italia : Centro illustrativo di Alfredo Baccarini. Roma, Tip. Elzev. 1875.

the Public Works Department, being in fact an abstract of the main hydrographic data for the sixty-nine provinces of Italy, indicating the area and population of each province, the topographical position of the chief towns, and their respective heights above the sea; the orography of the province, or distribution of hills and tableland; the area of woods, lakes, bogs, and marshes; the number, the length, the heights, and the minimum, mean, and maximum volumes of the water-courses; and observations as to temperature, barometric pressure, and rainfall. If we ask what steps have been taken in this country towards procuring such information, with regard to our own river system, as the Government of the King of Italy has secured within the first fifteen years of the consolidation of the kingdom, the answer is not one that does much credit to our mode of treating this important question.

In the excellent Ordnance Map of England the nation possesses a basis on which such a series of observations as those arranged in tables by the Italian Government may be founded. It would be possible for the officers of the Ordnance Survey to produce, at a very moderate cost, from their recorded observations, the greater part of such a hydrographical compendium. The lengths of our rivers and streams are ascertainable, no doubt, from Ordnance data. As to the levels of the different points, much, if not all that is requisite, must have been collected for the purposes of the Ordnance Survey, though it is not accessible to the public. But for the volumetric flow of the rivers hardly any data exist (except such observations of the height of floods as the Ordnance may possess); and even the few estimates which exist are, as we shall presently show, uncertain or even contradictory.

An appendix to the report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords in 1877 contains a statement of 210 rivers of England and Wales, divided arbitrarily into five classes according to the area of their catchment basins. It is difficult to understand on what scientific principle that statement was drawn up, nor is its utility very obvious, as, even if the details given were accurate, the utter want of arrangement renders them inconvenient for any practical use. As to their accuracy, all that we can say is, that they by no means agree with the latest attempt made to bring together such facts as are on record as to our inland water supply. This is to be found in a volume published in 1878 by the late Professor Ansted, under the title of 'Water and Water Supply.' The general surface drainage of England is divided into seven principal systems or groups of rivers. The names of from

1,600 to 1,700 rivers (of the United Kingdom) are indexed, and such information as it is easy to extract from the Ordnance maps as to lengths and areas of basin are given. This work, however, shows most distinctly how little attention has been given to the subject of volumetric flow, and can only serve as a sort of convenient skeleton on which to arrange more full and systematic information.

It is unfortunate that these two attempts to give some general view of the rivers of England should by no means agree, even in the very limited amount of information which they profess to afford. Thus against the seven drainage systems of Mr. Ansted, Mr. Grantham, who furnished the statement appended to the report above cited, sets ten first-class rivers each having catchment basins of 1,000 square miles and upwards. Among these he ranks as separate the Ouse, the Trent, and the Humber; the latter being, in fact, the estuary formed by the confluence of the two former, with other affluents. The catchment areas of the three Mr. Grantham gives as 8,979 square miles, Mr. Ansted as 10,500. None of the lengths exactly accord as given by the two writers. The Thames, which Mr. Ansted calls 225 miles long, Mr. Grantham sets down as 201 $\frac{1}{4}$, and the Tyne, which the former states to be 76 miles in length, the latter rates at 35 miles. The public is not greatly enlightened by conflicting accounts of this nature.

It will be observed that the return of 1870, above cited, refers to navigable waters alone, and only to such of them as are in the hands of companies. As to our great public rivers no official information exists, except in cases of reports to the various conservancy boards, or papers read to the Institution of Civil Engineers; nor is any knowledge attainable as to minor or non-navigable streams. In the Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers is to be found such information as has been, from time to time, brought before that body by its members and associates. A paper on the river Thames was presented to the Institution on March 27, 1877,* and discussed at some length. A section of the bed of the river, from London Bridge for a distance of forty-eight miles, to below the confluence of the Medway, was appended to the paper, but there are no cross sections, nor any sections or levels of the banks. In the discussion which ensued it transpired that 'few records of the flow of the Thames were accessible, and very different estimates were to be found in treatises on the hydraulics of

* Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers, vol. xlix. p. 17.
VOL. CLIII. NO. CCCXIV.

'rivers.' Thus Beardmore gives 45,000 cubic feet per minute as the ordinary discharge; Rennie gives 80,220 cubic feet; Stevenson gives 102,000 cubic feet. The 'Encyclopædia Britannica' gives 475,000 cubic feet, and 600,000 cubic feet as flood discharges; while Beardmore gave a maximum of 400,000 cubic feet, and Professor Unwin, from a gauging of the river at the Albert Bridge, estimates a flood discharge that occurred in 1875 at 840,000 cubic feet per minute. The large quantity of water which certain of the London water companies are authorised to abstract from the Thames renders the determination of its minimum flow a matter of extreme importance, even if regarded alone from a sanitary point of view.

The question of the floods of the Thames was under discussion on the occasion we have cited, and on several others. In December, 1861, on the reading of a paper by Mr. Bailey Denton on discharge from under-drainage, Mr. Bidder, the President of the Institution, pointed out the extreme importance of ascertaining how far the waterway under bridges was sufficient to carry off the increased volumes of water which land drainage was likely to hurry into rivers. Sir John Rennie then stated that the level of the water in the low fen districts, drained by the Welland, the Witham, and the Nene, had been reduced three feet below the surface, which was considered to be sufficient, by improvement of the outfalls. He pointed out that getting rid of the water, in time of floods, was only a portion of the duty of the engineer, and that it was essential to obtain a control of the water at all times, as much for purposes of irrigation in time of drought as for discharge in time of heavy rain. On February 29, 1876, a discussion took place, at the same Institution, on the floods in England and Wales during 1875, which mainly illustrated the quantity and the distribution of the rainfall in that exceptionally wet year. It was then shown that a fall of 5·3 inches in twenty-four hours was registered at Newport, 4·8 inches at Cardiff, and 4·64 inches at Caerleon. This was on July 15. The Avon then rose ten feet above its usual summer level; the Wye rose fourteen feet. The heights to which the Thames rose with the heavy rains of this year were not mentioned,* but the inapplicability of the projects for the mitigation of floods by flood-water reservoirs, in the basin of the Thames, was distinctly shown. To provide for the impounding of a single inch of rainfall over

* On November 18 the Thames rose 5 feet 8 inches above flood mark at Staines.

the catchment basin would entail an expenditure of 5,000,000*l.* In July 1875, the measured rainfall at twelve stations in the Thames valley ranged from 4·15 inches at Harlow to 6·33 inches at Great Missenden. For September of the same year, it ranged from 1·87 inch at Selborne to 3·08 inches at Compton Burrel. In the succeeding October, it ranged from 3·49 inches at Harlow to 7·89 inches at Wantage; and in November from 3·35 inches in North London to 5·04 inches at Cirencester. The most serious flood in this year, in the Thames valley, was that of July 21, on the Cherwell, the Kennet, and the Thames itself, below Reading. The central district of England was most affected by this flood, the Gloucestershire Avon, the Cambridgeshire Ouse, the Nene, the upper Trent and its affluents, the Teme, and the upper Mersey, all producing serious inundations. In the yet heavier rainfall of July 14, 1875, the Severn and its great affluents, and the Trent, had the heaviest floods, and the valley of the Thames was comparatively uninjured.

Although shorter in its course than the Thames, the river Severn discharges, in time of flood, a much larger volume of water than the former river. The rise of a Severn flood at Worcester Bridge is twenty-two feet, and its volume there was, in November 1852, equal to a discharge of 1,446,470 cubic feet per second. But among the loud complaints which have been heard of late as to damage from floods, the name of the Severn has been rarely mentioned. The reason is that in 1841 the Severn Commissioners obtained parliamentary powers for the improvement of the river, and consulted the late Sir William Cubitt as their engineer. The channel of the Severn in the upper district was intersected by numerous fords, composed of beds of red sandstone rock, marl, and gravel, which, during the summer months, acted as natural dams, dividing the river into a succession of deep and nearly quiescent pools, the fords forming rapids, with only some eighteen inches of water over them. The remedy adopted was the removal of these fourteen natural dams, which seriously impeded the discharge of the flood waters, and the erection of four solid weirs obliquely to the course of the stream, which divided this part of the river into four successive deep reaches, having a minimum depth of six feet. In connexion with each weir was made a lateral cut, including a lock, for the purpose of navigation. The fall of the Severn, at low water, is twenty-one feet (or twenty-one inches per mile) in the twelve miles between Stourport and Worcester, and nearly ten feet (or 4·75 inches per mile) in the twenty-eight miles between Worcester

and Gloucester. In 1860 it was found that the depth of the channel of the Severn had increased, in consequence of this judicious treatment, by from three to five feet, and that the highest flood level at Worcester had been lowered by two feet. Thus the regulation of the drainage proved eminently satisfactory. So, at least, it is stated in the reports read to the Institution of Civil Engineers, in 1845 and 1860, by the engineer of the Severn Commission. But in January 1881 a meeting took place under the presidency of the Earl of Coventry with a view to memorialise the Severn Commissioners because of the floods then existing. It is thus evident that, while much that is of great value has been effected on the Severn, the necessity of a central authority for the collection and distribution of the facts and experience of all hydraulic works carried out on our different river courses is of great urgency.

The foregoing account of what has been done in France and in Italy, in the way of obtaining such hydrographic information as is an indispensable preliminary for any intelligent attempt to bring river floods under efficient control, serves to show the lamentable want of accessible data of the same nature in the United Kingdom. At the same time it has afforded us an opportunity of pointing out the sources from which a certain portion of those data may be obtained. What are almost absolutely wanting in England are observations of the heights of river levels, in drought, in flood, and under ordinary circumstances; and of the volumetric flow indicated by such heights. We are also almost entirely without information as to the state of the banks of any of our rivers, the openings allowed for waterway, the obstructions caused by mills, and, with one or two exceptions, the profile of the bed and the section of the channel.

On the other hand, if it were once determined to collect and arrange such data as already exist, and to make those observations which are necessary to obtain a proper knowledge of our river systems, the materials in part exist for completing portions of the hydrographic survey in which the foreign tables are generally deficient. These are, first, the geologic survey, which in many parts of England has been completed, as a complement of the Ordnance map; and secondly our numerous observations as to rainfall. It is necessary to combine these two elements of hydrographic information, owing to the fact that the effect of a given quantity of rainfall is quite different when it falls on a pervious soil, and when it descends on rock, clay, or any impervious area.

Mr. George James Symons has, for more than twenty years, been engaged in organising a corps of observers of the

fall of rain over the British islands. His attention has been almost wholly directed to the consideration of hydrological subjects, which include water as floating vapour, its deposit as rain, its discharge in floods, its percolation for the supply of wells, its flow into rivers, and its evaporation. The observers, whose records form the basis of the work annually published by Mr. Symons, under the title of 'British Rainfall,' now number nearly two thousand. The whole of this work is done gratuitously and for the pure love of science. The value of the observations annually published is already very great; and whenever the time arrives that the hydrology of the United Kingdom is treated as the requirements of civilisation demand, the services of Mr. Symons will prove indispensable.

Reverting to the general European practice, we find that in Switzerland regular observations of hydrometric facts exist; they have been published for some years by a Hydrometric Commission, originated by M. Lauterburg. In Germany regular observations have been made on the principal rivers, but they are not published. As to the care bestowed by the Dutch and Belgian Governments on the supervision of their river *régime* it is unnecessary to insist. It is a matter affecting the very existence of the Low Countries. But perhaps the most instructive lesson that can be drawn from continental experience as to the difference between neglecting and intelligently caring for the courses of great rivers is supplied by Hungary. The regulation of the river Theiss is, according to a report on the catastrophe at Szegedin made by C. Herrich, Ministerial Counsel,* in course of completion on a plan of such magnitude as has never yet been attempted with reference to any great river. The success of the executed parts of the work, and the docility of the restrained river, have been so marvellous, that the Theiss may be pointed to as an example of what can be effected by the skill of the engineer when provided with due data. But the almost total destruction of Szegedin was brought about exclusively by the obstinacy of the municipality of that town in carrying out the very principle of independent action that is sanctioned by the Acts for the creation of Urban and Rural Sanitary Authorities in England, and by the Bill brought into Parliament in 1879 for Rivers Conservancy. The municipality refused to take their share in the general system of the defensive works of the Theiss, and reaped a bitter harvest for their independence.

* Magyar Mérnök-és Építész-Egylet Közlönye, vol. xiii. p. 245.

The length of the Theiss is 740 miles, that of the valley 440 miles. The surface which, in the first third of the present century, was often all under water, extends over 6,000 square miles. The levels are too low for drainage. On its lowest fifty miles the fall of the Theiss is only about one twenty-fourth part of that of the corresponding portion of the Rhine, and only a seventh part of that of the 'Po morto,' or stagnant part of the Eridanus. In the highest part of the river where works have been started, the fall is under nine inches in the mile, at Tokay only three inches, and between Szegedin and the Theiss mouth, at Tittel on the Danube, only three-fifths of an inch per mile. The width of the northern part of the river is 120 yards, increasing to 135 yards at Tokay, and to 250 yards at its junction with the Danube. The depth increases, in that distance, from thirty to thirty-seven feet. The volume of water poured into the Danube is stated at 5,400 cubic yards per second. Floods exist, practically, for the whole year, and twenty years ago there were floods for ten years running. It would lead us too far from the subject of our own river floods to describe the scheme by which the Hungarian engineer Vásárhelyi, supported by the Italian hydraulist Paleocapa, has succeeded in protecting 4,200 square miles out of the 6,000 formerly drowned. The alluvium of the Theiss has been made to yield rich crops of wheat, maize, and tobacco. The revenue of the country has been increased by millions of florins annually, and the national wealth by hundreds of millions.

The town of Szegedin, in spite of a very narrow escape from destruction in 1876, continued to assert its independence of the general system of improvement of the Theiss. The river was not widened, and the Maros tributary was not diverted to a point below the town, as required by the engineers, and urged by the neighbouring local regulation boards. In fact the English plan was consistently carried out by the Szegedin urban authority. The destruction of a large part of the town, of which the population only has been saved, has, however, had the effect of convincing the municipality. Their share in the general plan is now being carried out, and their town may ultimately become emulous of Buda-Pest.

We are perhaps too apt to regard rivers chiefly as picturesque features of inland scenery. Of their beauty in this respect there is, indeed, no doubt. Very few landscapes can long satisfy the eye in which there is no gleam of water. If anyone wishes to contrast the effect of the same contour of country, rich with rolling plains, tufted woods, and romantic

mountain peaks in the distance, with and without water, let him glance over the golden valley of the Avon from the bluffs of the Cotswolds, or over the hams of the Severn from the beech-clad ridge of Birdlip. The tidal flow of the Severn is unusual among English rivers—indeed, among the rivers of the world—rising at Chepstow, on certain occasions, as much as forty-four feet. In consequence of this great change of level bright links of water may be seen gleaming in the sun from a distant point of view when the tide is high, which are lost when the tide is in ebb. The difference in the beauty of the landscape, as seen under the two conditions, is not readily to be forgotten.

This, however, is but the view of the artist or of the poet. For the man who has any stake in the agricultural produce, or the busy industry of a country, a river is much more than a pictorial element of landscape. It is the visible presentment of an unsleeping energy, ever varying in its force, often varying in its mode of directing that force. The river is the reality which was symbolised by the legend of the spirit who might be summoned by the spells of the enchanter, but for whom it was thenceforth necessary to find constant work, on pain of being destroyed by the unexpended energy of the goblin. Very much of the present aspect of the world is due to the action of rivers. That action, if unchecked, is hostile to man. The universal tendency of uncontrolled water, in rain, torrents, and rivers, is to plane down the surface of the earth to one swampy level. Over vast districts this action annually goes on unchecked. The deltas of the largest rivers of the world are the abodes of fever and of ague, vast tracts of boggy Syrtis continually encroaching on the sea from the spoil brought down from the uplands. The courses of most rivers have been divided by hydrographers into three zones. The first is the zone of erosion, in which the rain, rapidly collecting into torrents, furrows the hillsides, and rolls down earth and pebbles to the valleys below. The second is the zone of transportation, through which, when swollen by floods, the rivers roll down the material that they have washed from the hills. The third is the zone of deposit, in which swamps and deltas encroach on the sea. No river, left to itself, will keep within a well-defined and permanent channel. Still and smiling as may be the summer aspect of a stream, there is the fury of the wild beast in its nature. Even the small and comparatively tranquil rivers of England are continually at work, here eroding their banks, there silting up their channels, in another place overflowing into marshes—everywhere demand-

ing the constant, and above all the intelligent, control of human conservators.

There are two planes, or nearly level surfaces, approximately parallel to each other, between which the chief phenomena of river action occur. It is needful for the hydraulist to pay equal attention to each of the two, and to their mutual relation. They are the high-water, flood, or back-water level at its highest, and the ebb, low-water, or drainage level at its lowest. For the beneficial action of rivers it is generally desirable to maintain the first at as high a level, the second at as low a level, as the physical features of the locality allow. The high-water level, in tidal rivers, is that to which the flood tide will ascend when unchecked by artificial obstacles, or in consequence of neglect. In rivers above the influence of the tide this level is that of the heaviest floods. Its height is available for purposes of navigation, of irrigation, of water storage and domestic supply, of scour, and of water power. The lower level is that of ebb spring tides in tidal estuaries, and of the river bottoms and valley drains in upland valleys. It must be kept down, not only in order to prevent damage from flood, but to effect agricultural drainage, to prevent irrigation from drowning land, to regulate the flow of currents, and to remove the obstacles to its own course which every river more or less creates under the influence of floods. The due regulation of a river system must provide for the proper balance between the high-water and the low-water levels.

It is thus obvious that the cry which some people have raised against mills is just one of those which ignorant persons are so apt to echo on first making a very partial acquaintance with facts. No doubt there are mills which are neither more nor less than nuisances. The same may be said of locks, weirs, and other contrivances, in themselves beneficial, but which, whether from neglect, from greediness, or from simple ignorance, have been placed or left where they do more harm than good. It may be the case that it is to the selfish use made by the miller of the water which he impounds that much damage is due. But it is far more common that the miller, like the farmer, is himself a sufferer from the ignorant neglect of the river. The principle of dividing a river of a certain inclination of bed into pounds, or successive levels, in which the level is kept up by weirs, is thoroughly sound. In many rivers it is essential to the maintenance of the regularity of the flow of water, as the beds and banks would be eroded by the current if it were allowed to run off freely. A weir is only the concentration, at a fit point, of those obstacles which the river would otherwise

continually form in its own bed with mischievous effect—that is to say, a weir properly designed and constructed, as a fit part of the general river system; and that the power otherwise wasted by the fall of water at a weir should be utilised by a mill is a portion of national economy. We have already seen the improvement that has been effected in the river Severn, both as to the maintenance of a navigable depth, and as to the discharge and lowering of floods, by Sir W. Cubitt's oblique weirs.

River floods, it is to be borne in mind, are not to be regarded as preventible evils. They are phenomena forming part of the general system of the hydrology of the country where they occur. They are, generally speaking, unavoidable; to a certain extent they may be highly beneficial; and the object which the hydraulist has to set before him is, not the prevention, but the control of floods. This will be obvious to any one who reflects on the extreme irregularity of the rainfall. The average depth of rain that falls in a year over the catchment area of the Thames is ascertained by the observations of Mr. Symons to be from twenty-four to twenty-five inches. On July 14, 1875, from one to three inches of rain fell, in twenty-four hours, at different stations in this watershed, from Harlow to Cirencester—that is to say, that the average supply of a whole month came down in a single day. Nor is it only in the proportion of thirty to one that the demands on the river for drainage became excessive. The absorption of rain by vegetation, by the soil, and by evaporation, is diminished almost as much as the supply is augmented. Out of two inches fall in a month, probably not one quarter would enter the river. But the loss of the two inches that fell in a day, due to these causes, would not be much more than a thirtieth part of the proportionate monthly loss.

Where we possess measurements of the flow of rivers, we find that the difference between the lowest, the mean, and the flood volumes (when not depending on the melting of snow) is to some extent proportional to the difference in the rainfall. That it is not exactly so, depends, it is probable, on the irregularity of the local fall, and on the want of a sufficient number of observations to determine the real fall over the whole watershed. Thus Professor Unwin's determination of a flood volume of 840,000 cubic feet per minute may be compared with Mr. Beardmore's estimate of an ordinary discharge of 45,000 cubic feet per minute for the Thames, and with a minimum flow of 35,000 cubic feet per minute. In the case of the Po, as before cited, the flood volume is thirty-two times

as much as the discharge at the *magra*, or time of drought. For the Tiber the proportion is twenty-eight to one, for the Adige twenty-five to one, for the Brenta forty to one. And none of these cases can be said to represent the rush of water which, for a few hours, may follow the burst of a water-spout on the hills, or an unusually heavy and prolonged rain. Under a waterspout which burst at Scarborough in 1867, a rain gauge that held a depth of nine inches of rain was filled and found running over.

Regarding, therefore, the probability that provision has to be made for a temporary discharge of at least from twenty to thirty times the summer flow of a river, it is evident that the arrangement of the channel is not a matter of perfect simplicity. Nature herself has taught the engineer how to deal with the problem of the summer and the winter flow of rivers. The broad and fertile valley of the Severn may be taken as an instance. Over great part of the rich district watered by the Severn, a low, wide, level track of considerable width is furrowed by the channel which the river has itself cut in the fertile alluvium. In ordinary times the river runs within this channel, in drought very much below the banks. In floods the whole valley becomes a river. When occurrences of this kind are regular, and the residents do not foolishly place buildings in the area subject to overflow, the result is extraordinary fertility, and little or no damage. It is only if a flood happens to come down when the hay is cut and lying on the ground that the cultivator of the Severn hams has to pay a penalty, by ill-fortune, for the wealth annually afforded him by the Severn floods.

We thus arrive at the necessity of providing, in any properly arranged river system, a double course or channel for the water. The main bed, or ordinary channel of the river, should be so proportioned to the volume of the ordinary flow as to prevent deposit or choking from want of water. A second or inundation channel must also be available, enclosed, where necessary, by special banks, and regarded as land subject to inundation. This inundation channel will generally produce, if properly managed, abundant crops of hay.

In cases where a river is embanked, and where the overflow channel is below the top of the river banks, a second and lower line of drainage is absolutely required. In many of our river valleys such a line now exists. When the river is divided into reaches, or pounds, the overflow water of the higher pound should be led into the main channel in the succeeding and lower pound. By the due regulation of this system

the double function of irrigation and of drainage may be discharged in most of our river valleys.

With regard to the magnitude of the hydrographic districts into which England is physically divided, no question can arise as to the four principal catchment areas of the Humber, the Wash, the Thames, and the Severn. The Dee and the Mersey, though now distinct in their outfall into the sea, may also with much propriety be grouped together. The sizes of these five natural provinces are such as to indicate the propriety of dealing with the intermediate portions of the island—we are not now speaking of Scotland—also as integral parts, making ten provinces in all. It is true that there are some individual rivers of importance, of which the Tyne may be taken as an example, which have already their own Boards of Conservators, and that in such cases objections may be, and indeed have been, raised to bringing such independent authorities under the control of any more general inspecting power. But considering the large size of those provinces of which, according to the general assent both of professional men and of committees of both Houses of Parliament, no division can be other than mischievous, it would show a strange irregularity of arrangement to make each smaller river that flows direct into the sea an administrative unit. The status and the pay of the engineer of the Severn valley, for example, would be widely different from those of an officer who had charge alone of a minor river. We are not about to insist on any points of detail; but the general advantage that will ensue from an arrangement that would provide the Local Government Board with a professional council of ten eminent men, each responsible for the engineering of a great water province (from which their salaries would be contributed), is too obvious to need enlarging upon. Unless a machinery be adopted for keeping the hydraulists of one part of the country fully informed of the experience derived from the other districts, we shall be guilty of great waste of power. The subject has hitherto been regarded rather from a political than from a hydrological point of view. As to the first aspect, we have declined to enter into the subject of the constitution of the Boards, or the distribution, between general and local supervision, of the financial element of the question. As to the second, no hesitation can be felt by any person familiar with the science and practice of hydraulics.

But we must yet go a step further in the direction of unity of control. Each river basin is, we may admit, whether it be large or small, so that it drain directly into the sea, an hydraulic

unit. But hydraulics, or the study of the outflow of water, forms only a portion of the general problem before us. The terms of that problem we have already given, as stated by Mr. Symons. Water, when once deposited in rain, follows the distribution of catchment basins. Even here, however, the orology of a district—that is to say, the definition of its hills—is not all that it is requisite to study. Rain may fall on the westward slope of a line of hills, and may yet feed the sources of a river running to the east. The Cotswold hills afford an example of this. The western bluff of this oolitic range forms the eastern boundary of the valley of the Severn, from the junction of the Avon valley to Leckhampton Hill, near Cheltenham. But the water that drains from this slope to the Severn is very little; the dip of the strata is to the east; and any rain that descends to an impervious bed on the slope or immediately at the foot of the Cotswolds is carried to feed the affluents, not of the Severn, but of the Thames. Thus, as far as concerns the actual rainfall that reaches the earth, a certain march, or border land, may frequently exist on the confines of two river basins, as to the hydraulic tendency of which we must regard rather the facts of geology than those of physical topography. The great river provinces are thus to some extent united with one another, and the hydraulic authorities of any one of them will have occasion for relations with those of the adjoining districts.

But if this is the case, to some extent, with the care of the rain after it has reached the earth, it is wholly impossible to prescribe any exact bounds for the meteorological part of the question. The hydrometric flow of rivers is but one element of the general hydrological problem. Sweeping aloft over the surface of the island, the rain-clouds pour down their contents with but little regard to the physical features of the country below. It is indeed true that the higher the level of the country, the greater, all other things being alike, is the rainfall. But even this general rule must be taken as subject to modifications. When we examine the rainfall at any moment, or for any given period of time, over all England, we shall at once perceive that it follows some laws quite distinct from those of the demarcation of hydraulic provinces. On July 14–15, 1875, a heavy rain-cloud reached the south-western shores of England, and advanced with a uniform movement of about seventeen miles an hour to the east. At the rainfall stations in Monmouthshire and Glamorganshire from $4\frac{1}{2}$ to $5\frac{1}{3}$ inches of rain fell in twenty-four hours. As the storm advanced, the fall became less heavy. The four-inch

fall did not extend over the whole of Wales, being bounded by the valley of the Dee to the north, and by the ridge of country parallel to the bank of the Severn on the south. The fall was again less to the north-east of the watersheds of the Severn and of the Thames. It was less, again, north of a line drawn from the estuary of the Wash to that of the Dee, and north of the Tweed it was inconsiderable in amount.

On July 19 a steady fall occurred over the whole of England, varied only by two or three circular patches of very heavy rain on the basins of the Teme, the Cambridgeshire Ouse, and one or two very restricted localities. On July 20 upwards of an inch of rain fell over the whole of central England, and upwards of two inches over a tract about 200 miles long from east to west, and fifty miles from north to south. On October 9 a heavy fall occurred over central England, especially in the dry district, extending north-east from Banbury towards Northampton. The fall at Banbury, and at all stations above it in the valley of the Cherwell, was three inches or upwards; consequently that river was excessively flooded, as was also the Avon, both at Stratford-upon-Avon and at Evesham, where, after the continued rain that fell to the 21st of the month, the river rose thirteen feet one inch above its usual level. On October 19–21 the distribution of the rainfall was again different, a band or zone, of the depth of two inches of rainfall, extending, for a width of from fifty to seventy miles, from the Solent to the Humber. Upwards of three inches fell over part of Staffordshire, while less than one inch fell in the extreme south-west of England, in Pembrokeshire, and in the eastern and south-eastern counties. The great quantity of rain that fell in these two days upon the already saturated ground of the midland district of England flooded all the low-lying lands, and the area under water was greater than had ever been the case since 1852, the only recent case with which it could be compared. From the 14th to the 18th November the weather continued to be of the same rainy type, and the result was that nearly the whole of the land flooded in October remained under water until the latter part of November.

This brief indication of some of the salient features of the rainfall of the year of floods, 1875—the great fall of which has since been far exceeded in 1878 and 1879—shows how independent are the meteorological conditions of England from those of the physical geography of the island. It also shows the great national importance of a properly arranged registry of the rainfall. Taken apart, the observations of each of Mr. Symons's 2,000 observers have no more value than that of any

casual observation of the height of a stream on a given day. Combined and digested, these observations give us a very intelligible view of the fall of rain that occurs over the island. Yet further multiplied and continued for a series of years, they would reduce our knowledge of the ombrology of the country to the state of definite scientific information.

It must be perfectly evident that, whatever may be said of the magnitude of hydraulic districts, there is but one unit for the registry of the rainfall, and that is the island of Great Britain. We have seen that individual observations are useless until they are combined. We have, we hope, shown that any combinations on a smaller scale than that of the island must fail to present as a whole the rainfall of any particular day or other period, and also would fail to inform the authorities of any particular watershed of the true character of an observed fall occurring over the sources of their supply. Whether an exceptionally heavy fall is strictly local, is spread over a large irregular area of country, or is general to the island, makes a material difference in the effect on each hydraulic district. It is thus indispensable that rainfall observations shall be collected at one central station, from which, in case of need, timely warnings may be despatched to the several hydraulic districts. If this arrangement be combined with a proper series of observations for the regulation of the floods, it will be easy to prevent the loss of either cattle or crops in the case of the recurrence of the worst weather yet registered in Great Britain.

We have said little as to the causes of the floods, and that chiefly on the ground that it is only by the survey of each river basin that anything worth attention can be said on that subject. As to the effect of land drainage on flood, the evidence is directly contradictory. As to mills, it is clear from the evidence that no sweeping conclusion is to be drawn. The utility, or otherwise, of any individual mill from an hydraulic point of view is a question only to be determined by the survey of the river on which it stands.

There can be no doubt that it is within the power of the engineer so to control the course of our rivers as to secure the beneficent while averting the disastrous, effects of flood. There can be no doubt as to the remunerative or self-supporting value of any works properly carried out for such an end. It may be questioned whether a sum of money equal to the loss occasioned by the floods of a single year, if properly expended, would not be enough to establish a very efficient control of the floods of many years. Into questions of rating we do not enter

further than to point out that, however the money be raised, it ought actually only to take the form of a loan on the security of the land, as the increase of produce to be effected by systematic reclamation and irrigation will be such as to replace the outlay within a very brief period.

We have to add that Sir Archdale Palmer and Mr. Magniac, M.P. for Bedfordshire (who has brought in a Bill for the Conservancy of Rivers), have expressed their opinions in the columns of the 'Times,' that the only way of obtaining what is required is to bring public opinion to bear on the question. Mr. Magniac very justly complains of the enormous expense, amounting to rather more than one shilling and sevenpence halfpenny per acre, to which the Thames Valley Drainage Commissioners were put by the provisions of the Act of Parliament, which obliged them to define the limits of their jurisdiction by survey. This is but one instance of the cost to which the whole country will be put by any legislation that first enacts laws and then proceeds to collect facts. To apply the same principle to England and Wales would cost more than 3,000,000*l.* On the true principle of the unity of control over a watershed the whole of this large sum is pure waste. It provides none of the hydraulic information which is wanted, but merely indicates the contour of a line of flood arbitrarily assumed to be probable. On the other hand, as an instance of the cost of survey where all arrangements are in the hand of the engineer in command, so that economy as well as convenience can be studied, we can cite the great trigonometric map of Palestine. The field work for this map, which is on the English Ordnance scale of one inch to the mile, is of an unusually intricate character, owing to the accentuation of the ground. But the whole 6,000 miles have been accurately surveyed at a cost of less than three-halfpence per acre. The main point on which we are anxious to have the public thoroughly with us is the very simple one of not going to work until we know what is to be done. The first requisite is to know the real facts of the case. With a proper survey of the basin of a great river in his hand, any one out of hundreds of engineers can point out the steps that should be taken. Without such a survey, Lombardini or Belgrand, no less than Sir John Hawkshaw, would refuse to venture even a general opinion. We trust it will not be for very much longer that England will lie under the disgrace of being almost the only one of the nations of Europe that remains in utter and contented ignorance of the meteorological and hydraulic facts of her numerous and beautiful river basins.

ART. VI.—*La Pellagra in Italia.* Annali di Agricoltura.
Published by the Minister of Agriculture and Commerce.
Rome: 1880.

PROBABLY few persons in this country have ever heard of the *pellagra*; and fewer still have any idea of the enormous importance and thrilling interest of the terrible subject for Italians, and of the degree in which the mysterious circumstances surrounding it, and the world-wide importance of the social problems connected with it, must interest everybody. The *pellagra* is a very horrible, very singular, and in many respects very mysterious, malady, which for somewhat more than a century past has afflicted certain very definitely separable portions of the population of certain provinces of Italy. It seems to have been unknown before the middle of the eighteenth century. Some authorities maintain that a few cases of it may be traced in medical records of a much earlier period. But it is doubtful whether the disease was the same; and it is certain that before the time mentioned it had not, at all events, assumed any such development as to render it a matter of national concern, or to attract the attention of medical observers and writers, as it has of late years done to a degree which, as will be seen in the following pages, shows that the nation and the profession are thoroughly awakened to the vital importance of the subject. We are sometimes told, and it is believed abroad, that the condition of the population of the west of Ireland in bad years is the most deplorable that can be conceived. Our readers will know, when they have perused this article, that in some of the most fertile parts of Italy, with a radiant sun and a prolific soil, the condition of the peasantry is far worse than anything which has ever existed in the United Kingdom.

It may be stated at starting that the volume, the title of which is prefixed to this article, is highly creditable to the department from which it emanates, and to the great variety of persons on whose reports, investigations, and studies it is based. It does not profess to solve any of the very difficult and involved questions which the consideration of the subject raises, or even to advocate any of the very many opinions which have been put forth concerning it. It simply registers an enormous quantity of facts, which have been collected mainly by the machinery of circular questions addressed to communal and medical authorities, and records the various, and in many respects contending, opinions which have been put for-

ward, with the grounds on which they are based. It will be seen that the medical profession, foremost as usual when any work needed in the material interests of humanity is to be done, have spared no amount of toil and thought upon the subject, with as yet no great or definite measure of success.

We shall begin with a succinct but accurate description of the nature of the malady, and of the effects it produces in the victims to it. The earliest sensations of the person attacked consist of an itching, and redness of a somewhat erysipelatous appearance, in the hands and feet. This is rapidly followed by the disappearance of all subcutaneous adipose matter, and the diminution in volume of the entire body of the patient. The angular and protruding parts of the person become markedly prominent. The skin becomes abnormally thin, wrinkled, dark yellow, and often blackish in colour, and covered with scales to a greater or lesser degree. The atrophy and wasting away of the entire body soon become visible also in the muscular tissues, which are rapidly reduced in volume. The pulse becomes continually more and more rapid, thready, and evanescent. The temperature declines, the nails grow into the flesh, all the movements of the body are slow and languid; the sensibility is notably diminished, sometimes to such a degree as to allow of the introduction of a needle without its being perceived by the patient. 'Finally,' writes the author from whose description the above has been taken, 'the patient, dried up, hard to the touch, inert, apathetic, motionless, insentient, with sunken eyes and deadened look, becomes a mere mummy unconsciously awaiting the opening of his grave.'

Another author, writing of the somewhat diversified manifestations of a slightly varied form of the disease, says that, in what is called the slow *pellagra*, the patient, after long sufferings, becomes more and more downcast and wasted away. The skin becomes thin and corrugated, the muscles are insufficient, the heart small, the lungs inert; the membranes become thin, and break; hæmorrhage take place; there is diminution of the blood-corpuscles, effusion of serum, obstinate costiveness, diarrhœa, great disturbance of the intellectual faculties, and the individual, imbecile, with blue lips, with the angles of the mouth drivelling, presents the most piteous spectacle that can be conceived. A tendency to suicide is a marked and well-recognised characteristic of the disease; and it so frequently issues in madness as to render the provincial mad-houses in many cases insufficient. The compiler of the volume we are introducing to the reader thus sums up the general results of the disease. It predisposes the females to sterility and mis-

carriage. It renders the men incapable of labour, and compels them to become beggars, and eventually drives them mad. It produces a degenerate race, the individuals of which can only in special and exceptional cases be cured. It perturbs society in all its economic arrangements for the purpose of keeping alive those who live only to suffer and to consume, without working or producing.

Having thus given some, but a very imperfect, idea of the horrible condition of those affected by the *pellagra*, we will next proceed to indicate its rate of progress and development and present extent in Italy. And, in the first place, as to the parts of Italy subjected to the scourge. If a line be drawn across the peninsula from the shore of the Adriatic near Ascoli to the south of Ancona, and passing to the north of the Abruzzi be brought down to the Mediterranean coast a little to the south of Rome, all the territory to the south of this line is wholly free from any taint of *pellagra*. The province of Siena and the contiguous province of the Tuscan Maremma to the north of the described line are also free, as is also the strip lying along the Ligurian coast. The islands of Sicily and Sardinia are entirely exempt. All the other provinces of Italy, comprising the richest and most civilised parts of the country, are more or less infected with the disease - more or less, but the phrase embraces a very wide scale of difference. The volume published by the Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce gives the number of infected persons in every commune in the most minute detail. But it will suffice for our present purpose to state, taking the facts from a map attached to the volume referred to which is shaded to indicate the intensity of the infection, that the provinces of Brescia, Padua, Piacenza, and Ferrara are the most heavily afflicted. In the province of Brescia the victims of *pellagra* are more than eighty per thousand of the rural population; in that of Padua more than fifty-seven per thousand; in that of Piacenza more than fifty-one per thousand; and in that of Ferrara more than fifty-five per thousand. Next in intensity of the scourge come Milan (the province), Bergamo, Cremona, Parma, Treviso, Venice, and Rovigo. In these provinces the *pellagrosi* number from thirty to fifty per thousand of the rural population. Next come the provinces of Vicenza, Belluno, Udine, Lucca, in which the *pellagrosi* number from twenty to thirty of the rural population. Then we have Verona, Modena, Bologna, Pesaro, Arezzo, in which the victims of the disease number from ten to twenty of the rural population; then Reggio and Forlì, where from five to ten per thousand of the rural popu-

lation are affected ; and, lastly, the provinces of Turin, Novara, Como, Sondrio, Cuneo, Alexandria, Pavia, Genoa, Massa, Ravenna, Florence, Pisa, Ancona, Macerata, Ascoli, Perugia, and Rome, in which the number of the diseased is less than five per thousand of the rural population. In recapitulation it may be said, speaking roughly, that all the northern half of the peninsula is infected, and all the southern half free. It is necessary to bear this very singular fact in mind, for it is a cardinal one in the reasoning and arguments concerning the causes of the disease.

It will have been observed that in giving the above statistical details the rural population has been mentioned as that to which they apply ; and this brings us to one of the most singular and at the same time significant facts in the history of this extraordinary malady. The inhabitants of cities and towns are never touched by it. Its ravages are confined exclusively to the rural labouring population. The poverty, misery, squalor, filth, which characterise the rural populations subject to it, may frequently be found in an equal degree among the lowest strata of the inhabitants of the towns ; but, whatever other evils and diseases they may produce, they do not produce *pellagra*. In the few cases which may have been met with here and there in some towns, it has invariably been found that the patient was an incomer from the country and had brought the disease with him. It has moreover frequently occurred that persons coming to reside in a town, even in a condition of great misery, who have been afflicted by *pellagra*, have recovered solely by means of their change of residence. These facts also, as it will be readily perceived, are of primary importance in the quest for the *causa causans* of the complaint.

It may be mentioned here, for the prevention of hypotheses not in accordance with all the facts of the case, that, though Italy is afflicted by this scourge to a much greater degree than any other country, the *pellagra* exists, and is recognised as such, in certain districts of France, of Spain, and of Roumania. As regards France, a Memoir by Dr. Petit, of Cette, printed in the volume under examination, shows that, although many notices of an obscure disease which probably was genuine *pellagra* may be met with at much earlier periods, it was not until 1818 that the subject received in France an amount of scientific attention likely to contribute to a real knowledge of the nature and etiology of the malady. It was Dr. Hameau, of Bordeaux, who first in that year called the attention of the medical and scientific world to the subject. He does not, however, seem to have been aware that the disease which had

attracted his attention and interest was the *pellagra* so well and disastrously known in Italy. This discovery was made shortly afterwards by Drs. Gintrac and Bonnet, of Bordeaux, and their suspicion of the truth was soon confirmed beyond the possibility of error by Dr. Arthaud, who had examined the disease in Lombardy. Of the period of its first appearance in France it is admitted that nothing can now be known. The localities subject to it in that country may be divided into three groups, all in the south-west or south. The first is the region formed by the department of the Landes and of that part of the Gironde which is similar to the Landes in the character of its soil. The cultivation of this district consists of millet, rye, a small quantity of maize, and a few rare vineyards. The soil does not suffice for the nourishment of the miserable populations which cultivate it. The work they perform is excessively severe; they are very ill-fed; sleep in their clothes; and they and the wattled hovels in which they dwell are horribly filthy. Their food consists mainly of boiled millet meal, a little rye, mostly damaged, sometimes a few sardines, and rancid lard. They have no wine, and drink exclusively water, generally of very bad quality. Maize rarely enters into their diet. (This fact is important, and must be remembered. We shall have occasion to recur to it.) Dr. Petit states that the *pellagra* does not exist in France in the same proportions and intensity as in Italy. Yet he says that in certain communes of the Gironde there exist as many as 200 *pellagrosi* in 6,000 inhabitants, i.e. one in thirty. Yet, after having said this of certain communes of the Gironde, Dr. Petit remarks that the department of the Landes is the part of France where the disease rages with the greatest intensity. The second region of France, marked by the existence of *pellagra*, consists of the departments of the Hautes and Basses Pyrénées. The population is terribly indigent, but hardly so much so as that of the district last under consideration. The third region is that known as the plain of Lauraguais, which belongs partly to the Haute-Garonne and partly to the Aude. Unlike the case of the two above-named districts, this plain is very fertile. Some, too, of the regions devastated by the *pellagra* in Italy are among the richest in the world. But the unhappy beings who cultivate them are none the better off for that. The peasant who tills the plain of Lauraguais 'works,' says Dr. Petit, 'for a master who pays him with a portion of the crop. Of this he sells the better portion, and eats the inferior part. The money thus obtained, far from serving to improve his

‘nourishment, is hoarded for the purchase of a scrap of land. This is the great object of every peasant. It is difficult to form an idea of the labour and privation that he supports to attain it. He toils under the hottest sun like a beast of burthen; he clothes himself in rags; he inhabits a dwelling where all is as it should not be,’ all with this object. Dr. Petit goes on to describe with much detail the miserably poor nourishment on which these men live. It is bad enough. But it may be said at once that the *menu* of the peasant of the Lauraguais is far superior to that of the Lombard tiller of the soil; and that the latter would as soon think, and might as reasonably think, of appropriating an estate in the moon, as of ever by any possibility being able to purchase enough land to furnish him with a grave! ‘From all that we have said,’ continues Dr. Petit, ‘it results that the *pellagra* is met with only among the indigent. The rich are generally’—Italian authorities would say, invariably—‘exempted from it.’ But it needs no scientific investigation to tell us this. This fact is but too abundantly clear; and is about the only fact as regards the etiology of the malady on which there can be, and never has been, any doubt. In concluding this short *résumé* of Dr. Petit’s report on the *pellagra* in France, it is necessary to remark that, whereas he has said, in speaking of the peasants of the Gironde, that maize rarely forms any part of their alimentation, he says at a subsequent page, after having enumerated all the districts where the *pellagra* exists, and the Gironde among them, ‘in all these provinces the flour of this grain (maize) enters largely into the alimentation of the population.’ It will be seen presently that this contradiction is a very important one.

As regards Spain, a report presented to the Academy of Medical Sciences of Catalonia mentions certain communes of the Asturias, some districts of Lower Arragon, some parts of the province of Guadalajara, as infected by *pellagra*, and says that it exists sporadically in other parts of the country. It seems that the disease had not attracted any special observation in Spain before 1835; and the Memoir presented to the Academy of Catalonia asserts that the disease is steadily and notably decreasing both as regards the numbers of individuals assailed and the intensity of the attacks. The Memoir adduces a great mass of concurrent testimony to the fact, which it regards as perfectly proved, that *pellagra* exists in districts where no maize is cultivated or used as food. On the other hand, it is asserted by the authors of the Memoir that in the Basque provinces and in the former kingdom of

Valencia, where maize is largely cultivated and consumed as food by the inhabitants, not a single case of *pellagra* is known to have ever existed.

The Italian Consul at Galatz, called upon by his Government to report on the existence and conditions of *pellagra* in Roumania, declares it to be the general opinion in that country that the appearance of *pellagra* there was contemporaneous with the introduction of the cultivation of maize. He agrees with everybody else who has written on the subject, that the malady attacks only the very poor and under-fed, and prevails most among those who use damaged maize corn. But information thus vague is of little value. The question is not whether *pellagra* prevails most among those who use maize or damaged maize, but whether it is exclusively confined to either of these categories of persons.

Having thus briefly mentioned the other parts of Europe besides Italy in which the disease is known, and noticed those of the circumstances characterising it in each of them which are of importance in the consideration of the etiology of it, we will return to the very sad and terrible picture which the large number of observers who have given special study to the subject in Italy present to us. And, in the first place, we will examine a very detailed and well-drawn report furnished by the Chamber of Commerce of Pavia, which describes the general condition of the rural labouring population in that province. In the province of Pavia, contrary to the custom of northern and central Italy, the land is not much subdivided into small properties. The soil is very productive. Irrigation on a large scale has been in use there for a very long time. So much so, that at the beginning of this century three-fourths of the district of Pavia itself, and five-eighths of the district known as the Lomellina, were subjected to a very complete system of irrigation. These proportions have been since increased by the opening of new canals, and especially by the colossal work known as the Cavour Canal. The result of this combination of circumstances—of the size of the farms, and of the nature of the cultivation arising from the irrigation—has been to cause the administration and management of these farms to assume a gradually increasing resemblance to the methods and habits of great industrial enterprises, and a proportionate departure from the old ways and customs of agricultural life.

‘These vast properties,’ say the Pavian reporters, ‘with the economical exigencies arising out of the cultivation of them, had the immediate effect of causing the small farms to disappear, and of abolishing the

small landowners, who little by little became reduced to the condition of mere labourers, depending on the great proprietors, and on the managers of these great agricultural establishments. Hence has come to pass the destruction of the old agrarian system, inasmuch as corn-fields, vineyards, and orchards, gave place to vast rice-grounds and water-meadows, which necessarily involve a different kind of life in the cultivators, and a progressive deterioration in the organic constitution itself of the population.'

About one-third of the district under consideration is in the hands of the owners. The other two-thirds are let on lease. The rural 'colony'—*colonia*—remarks the reporter, could not exist here, because the minutely divided cultivation, which is indispensable to that system, is incompatible with the nature of these great establishments. The 'colony' system, which the writer refers to, consists in the division of the land into farms, each deemed large enough to be cultivated by the family of the farmer, who either pays a rent for it, or, as in Tuscany, shares the produce in equal moieties with the proprietor. This last system, as it is seen in operation in Tuscany, has been criticised as anti-economical and opposed to agricultural improvement. But beyond all question the rural labouring population who live under it are the most happy, prosperous, and healthy in Europe.

The labourers in the districts under examination are divided into three classes—the *fixed*, the *salaried*, and the chance or *disengaged* labourers. In the social scale, the second of these classes comes first. The reporter seems to have treated the so-called 'fixed' peasants first because of their greater number. These 'fixed' labourers are with their families hired for one or more years in such number as the manager may deem necessary; and a contract, sometimes written, sometimes verbal, passes between the parties, and generally runs from Martinmas to Martinmas. This contract fixes the amount of wages and of allowances (of which more anon), the quantity of wood allowed for fuel, the exact number of pales to be used for the fence of the labourer's garden, and the rent to be paid for his dwelling and garden. Not very long ago the dwelling and garden used to be given gratuitously. Such is no longer the case. Every labourer, whether fixed or salaried, has a fourth, or sometimes a third, of the produce of twelve perches of ground, the quantity needed for seed being deducted. This in the case of maize is worth to the labourer about eight hectolitres of grain. The fixed wage is 50 centimes (fourpence halfpenny, paper currency) per diem. But, as the reporter reminds us, this is only paid for actual working days, which,

allowing for holidays and bad weather, can never be calculated at more than 240 in the year. This wage is the same as was customary before the commencement of the present order of things. But in those days the labourer also received his food, consisting of a stated quantity of soup and 14 ounces of maize bread from September 29 to April 24. From April to September a second meal of 14 ounces of maize bread, with salad, was given. 'At the present time,' says the reporter, 'the food which used to be given has been suppressed without any compensation of any kind!' And he makes no further remark upon this most extraordinary fact! That a whole rural population should have submitted, with tears and groans enough, but with no more violent manifestation of resistance, to such an arbitrary and oppressive innovation, seems very surprising, and is a most suggestive indication of the miserable and downtrodden condition of these unhappy people. According to ancient custom, the rural labourer in these districts receives in addition to the daily wage of his labour sundry small advantages, consisting mainly of a portion of the product of the soil, and certain customary perquisites at harvest-time. But the rules and regulations which govern these are exceedingly minute and complex, though observed with a strictness that testifies to the keenness with which the last penny of advantage is looked after on either side. It would take considerable space to make every part of the system intelligible to a reader wholly unacquainted with the subject; and fortunately the attempt to do so is unnecessary, because the very careful and diligent reporter whose statements we are following has, with the utmost minuteness and accuracy, reduced every one of these subsidiary advantages and profits to its exact money value. The statement of the 'fixed' peasant's yearly budget which results from his 'calculation' is as follows:—

Wages for 260 * days	130	francs
Profit on partial produce of soil	160	"
Other small allowances	75	"
*	365	"

or just one (paper) franc, value ninepence, a day.

Out of this sum he pays to his master for his dwelling 30 francs; and, as the reporter points out, in bad years, which he

* In another place the reporter estimates the available days in the year at 240 only. We suppose that he here has taken them at 260 in order to avoid any possible suspicion of an attempt to colour the picture he is drawing more blackly than the truth warrants.

reckons at one in three, the falling off in the labourer's subsidiary gains will reduce the franc to 80 centimes for each day in the year. To which, however, may be added, as the reporter estimates, 80 francs a year for the wages of the field labour of his wife, thus bringing the entire sum on which the family has to subsist to 445 francs.

'Thus,' continues the reporter, 'his daily gain is one franc and twenty-one centimes, with which he has not only to maintain himself and his wife, but also his children and those who are too old to work; to pay thirty francs a year for hire of his dwelling; to provide himself with clothes, especially for the winter; to buy flax or hemp for the preparation—God knows how!—of some small articles of linen; to save up, with long-sighted providence, some little matter for a daughter to take to her husband when she is married (it seems like a bitter irony to speak of such a thing); and to provide for sickness!'

It is generally imagined by Englishmen that Italians are not hard workers, given rather to lazy shirking of work than otherwise. This may be so to a certain degree in the cities, where Englishmen mainly know them. But it should be understood that the work for which these Pavian cultivators of the rice-grounds receive the above-described remuneration is labour compared with which a long day at the plough-tail or at hedging and ditching is mere play and pleasant exercise. It is labour of the most exhausting description, carried on under every circumstance calculated to aggravate its intensity, especially unhealthy, and demanding an ample and generous scale of nutriment for the restoration of the daily-exhausted vital energies. It need hardly be said that the food procurable by the means which have been described can by no possibility be more than barely sufficient to keep body and soul together.

'The extreme gravity of this state of things,' continues the reporter, after the completion of his estimate of the peasant's earnings, 'will become yet more evident if it is considered (1) that the condition of the rural labourer, as it is at the present day, especially in the district of Pavia, has become very notably worse than it was in 1850; (2) that the gains and allowances of all the classes of labourers have remained stationary or have diminished, despite the general augmentation which has taken place during the last twenty years in all other salaries and payments; (3) that, as a result of these facts, at least 19,600 families of "fixed" peasants are compelled, if not to suffer the pangs of hunger habitually, yet assuredly to make use of aliments unfit and insufficient to restore the vital energies worn out by excessive labour, or to invigorate an organism continually struggling against unhealthy and deleterious agencies; (4) that the peasant of this irrigated region, by reason of his having become degenerate as regards his physique, obtuse of mind, and devoid of any energy or special aptitude, cannot ameliorate

his condition by applying himself during his days of compulsory idleness and the long winter evenings, to any of those subsidiary resources, by means of which the inhabitants of the Brianza and the sub-Alpine districts greatly benefit themselves. The peasants of those regions turn their hands to weaving, to blacksmith's work, to lace or toy making, and, if all other resources fail, have recourse to emigration; all which aids and expedients are absolutely unknown to the brutalised and timid inhabitants of these lowlands, who are, in truth, more like working machines than thinking beings.'

To this terrible picture the reporter, evidently wishing to be absolutely and accurately truthful, appends a remark to the effect that it must be observed that in the district of the Lomellina things are a little better; seeing that there the united labour of the peasant and his wife may be reckoned to bring them 'very nearly' one franc and a half per diem.

The reporter then proceeds to consider the condition of the 'salaried' labourers, who form the aristocracy of their class. These fortunate persons enjoy a somewhat higher rate of wages, and a larger and greater number of perquisites and allowances, into all the details of which the writer enters with care and accuracy. But it is not necessary for us to follow him, because in this case also he reduces the whole to a money value, and thus shows that the gains of the 'salaried' labourer 'are never less than 1 franc 37 centimes a day, and, 'computing the earnings of his wife, come very near 1 franc '55 centimes.' This is the case with the ordinary 'salaried' labourer. The reporter goes on to show that on every farm there are certain superior employments which are better paid. The bailiff may have in pay and perquisites some 900 francs a year; the head of the cheese department perhaps somewhat more; and others, employed as foremen and overseers, advantages in smaller degree, which yet place them much above the rank and file in the social scale. But of course these favourites of fortune are too few in number to make any appreciable difference in the general features of the picture.

Lastly come the 'disengaged' labourers, whose lot is the worst of all. Of course, as the reporter remarks, they are subjected to all the vicissitudes and uncertainties of the inexorable law of supply and demand. The price of their day's labour, however, everything considered, may be averaged at 80 centimes a day, as nearly as may be 7*d.* a day! At harvest-time they may get for a few days 2 francs, or sometimes even as much as 3 francs. But the period during which this is possible is so short that, as the reporter observes, it does not to any material degree alter the general features of

the case. The maximum of the wages of the disengaged labourer may, under the most favourable circumstances, rise, thinks the reporter, to 1 franc 25 centimes. But it must not be forgotten that this is for 220, or, at the utmost, 240 days only in the year. About 7,500 families are living in the two districts under consideration in this most miserable condition. It must be remembered also that there is no poor law, nor any similar legal provision against absolute starvation, in this country. There is in the city of Pavia a charitable institution called the *Pia casa d'Industria*; and there is a constant tendency of the most wretched of the rural poor to throng into the city. In the winter months accordingly the inmates of the *Pia casa d'Industria* rise to tenfold its normal population. In the year 1855 this institution contained 629 persons in June, and 16,870 in January. At the present day the inmates are much more numerous. Of course, however, the last refuge of these unfortunates is the hospital. They are received into the various endowed hospitals, in which Italy is very rich, if their case is judged to be curable. If, as in the great number of cases, they are pronounced to be chronic sufferers, 'these destitute rustics, rejected by the public establishments, are condemned to drag out their miserable existences as it may please God!' (The phrase is a shocking one in such a connexion.) 'And although it is true that there is a beneficent law which provides that chronic sufferers shall be received at the cost of the commune in which they may have lived for the longest time, everybody knows how hard a thing it is in practice to get together the necessary proofs, and how the law is but too often disobeyed from motives which it is not necessary to state.' It is impossible, says the reporter, a little further on, to think without sorrow and shuddering of a mass of some thirty thousand families compelled to endure daily ten or eleven hours of most exhausting and unhealthy labour, for little, if anything, more than one franc per diem, with which, incredible as it seems, they have to support an entire family. The fact is, he goes on to say, that if they do not die of immediate famine from absolute want of food, they assuredly do die of chronic famine, caused by the bad quality as well as insufficiency of their food, which is not fitted to restore the expenditure of life.

The flour of maize, either in the form of bread or of *polenta*—a kind of porridge or pudding made by boiling the maize meal with water—forms the basis of the food of these populations. Now, as the reporter so often quoted assures us, it is rarely the case that the peasant obtains this meal in a

good and wholesome state. Very frequently the maize does not perfectly ripen in the northern parts of Italy, or at least has not perfectly ripened when it is harvested. Very often also the grain is stored in a more or less damp condition. The result of either of these circumstances is that the maize grain very quickly develops a fermentation, which is the first step towards rottenness, and which, there is strong reason to think, causes it to be in a very high degree deleterious. But the reporter of the Pavia Chamber of Commerce tells us that, even if the peasant carries grain in perfect condition to the mill, he is almost sure to receive back flour which is the produce of damaged corn. The miller receives it, takes from it the deductions demanded by the unhappy grist-tax,* generally, says the reporter, unfairly and exorbitantly made, and the deduction in payment for the grinding, and then delivers to the peasant not the flour from the corn he has brought, but a corresponding quantity from his store of already ground corn. And this, says the reporter, is almost always of the most detestable quality, the product probably of grain which the miller has received from peasants indebted to himself.

The reporter next goes on to show the evils arising from the ignorance and negligence—in great measure occasioned by absolute want of means to do better—with which the peasant's food is prepared. He takes his wretched and unwholesome maize meal, and mixes with water a sufficient quantity to last the family for eight days or more. He divides this into loaves of immense size, and puts them into an oven very insufficiently heated with probably wet wood, and withdraws them after a very insufficient time, burned on the outside and wet and nearly raw in the inside. In two or three days this horrible mass becomes acid and mouldy. But, as the reporter says, 'hunger is stronger than disgust; and the poor peasants are constrained by it to swallow a food than which nothing can be conceived more foul and pernicious;' and, 'in one of the most fertile districts of Italy,' those who cultivate it are 'compelled to live almost exclusively on a bread so abominable that in general the very pigs refuse it.'

The space at our command will not allow us to follow the Pavian reporter through the interesting pages in which he shows how fatally and almost inevitably the peasant is led to become the debtor of the miller or the usurer, in these regions generally one and the same person; how from the moment he does so his ruin is sealed, and he has but to drag his

miserable limbs through the labour of the day for a short time till want and disease finish him. One little fact may, however, be gleaned from this part of the reporter's work, for it is curious. In his impartial anxiety to state every circumstance that in any degree tends to alleviate the condition of these most miserable populations, he writes: 'One small assistance to their diet—the only one—the peasants find in the frogs, which from April to September furnish a pleasant and wholesome food, of which in this district more than five thousand quintals are consumed annually!'

Having noticed as one element in the miserable sanitary condition of these populations the fact that the water they drink is almost invariably of the worst possible description, the reporter goes on to speak of the habitations of the peasants of this rich and fertile soil, one or two passages from his description of which, we think it well to translate.

'The dwellings are squalid and unwholesome, to a degree which no imagination could paint, and which must affect with horror every human mind. In truth, if any visitor should enter any one of the habitations of our labourers, even of the "salaried" class, we would wager that the impression he would receive would remain with him to the latest day of his life. *He would see, in the midst of the richest fields of Italy, amidst cultivation which brings the proprietor a larger profit than that of any other district in the peninsula, a cultivation which, for amount of production, may be compared to the best English or Flemish agriculture; he would see, we say, a population morally reduced to the condition of brutes, and physically ruined by the inhuman severity of its labour, by its infamous food, and by the shameful condition of its dwellings.*'

It is unnecessary to follow the writer of this fearful sentence—not a partisan, not even an individual be it remembered, but the mouthpiece of a body of enlightened men, who are confessing the horrors of their own locality—into his minute description of the dens he has been speaking of. But the touch with which he finishes his review of this part of his subject must not be omitted.

'The managers of these estates,' he says, 'are anxious solely for the increase of their own profits, and therefore when they are able to obtain from the landlord the funds for any amelioration, it is spent exclusively on the barns, the cheese-houses, the haylofts, the stables, which, with a cruel contrast, are often seen admirably well-built and handsome, while the dwellings of the peasants seem, instead of the habitations of reasoning beings, to be the dens of foul animals!'

With regard to the promotion of efforts for the amelioration of the state of things, it is worth notice that the Chamber

of Commerce, whose views the reporter embodies, declares its conviction that the execution of any measures to be adopted must be entrusted to royal inspectors appointed for the purpose; for that it is wholly vain to expect any good from any provisions the carrying out of which should be entrusted either to the municipal or provincial authorities, bodies created by election.

To those political economists who, considering the lamentable state of things described in this report, may be disposed to find the cause in, or seek the remedy from, the despotic theory of supply and demand, it may be interesting to note that we find it stated in a separate report of the Prefect of Pavia to the Government that the number of hands available for agricultural labour in that province is somewhat below the demand. This gentleman, it may be mentioned, estimates the average number of days' labour in the year at 280 instead of 260 estimated by the Chamber of Commerce of Pavia. We are disposed to think the latter the surer authority.

In 1875 the Minister of Agriculture and Commerce issued a circular to all the Prefects requiring replies to a series of questions respecting the condition of the rural labouring population. We have those replies before us; and, in answer to the question whether, and in what measure, agricultural wages have increased during the last ten years, we find that almost all the Prefects report a considerable rise; from the case of Milan, where the price of disengaged day labour is reported to have become threefold what it was previously, and Como, whose Prefect briefly states that all agricultural labour has doubled in value, to the southern provinces, where the returns speak of augmentations of from 15 to 20 per cent. But we find no return on this subject from the Prefect of Pavia. Many of the Prefects assign as a cause for the rise of wages the increased dearness of provisions, and most of them point out that the rise in this respect has been such as to neutralise any benefit to the labourer from his increased wages.

Another series of returns from the Prefects in reply to questions submitted by the Minister as to the existing relations and state of feeling between the owners of the land and the peasants offers much that is interesting. But it is evident that when the replies to such questions are not reducible to figures, the uncertainty which attends them, by reason of the differing opinions, temperaments, capacity, and intelligence of those who are called upon to furnish them, renders them very unsafe data for the formation of a definite opinion. We have, for instance, in the series of returns we are

speaking of, diametrically contradictory statements from two adjoining provinces, the economical and social conditions of which do not seem to supply any intelligible cause for such difference. It may, however, be gathered from the replies generally that the relation between proprietor and labourer is better in the hill country than in the plain, and in the north than in the south; that it is decidedly much better where the soil is much divided and properties run small; and that the difference is still more strongly marked between tenant farmers and landlords managing their own properties, the greater care of the latter for the labourers being strikingly manifest. Most of the Prefects report indeed that the farmers of leasehold estates have no care whatever for the labourers who work for them, and think of nothing save extracting the uttermost farthing of profit possible from their bargains.

It will have been seen from the statistics given on a previous page that the province of Pavia is by no means one of those most afflicted by the *pellagra*. The cause of this probably is that the rural population does not live exclusively on maize, but is enabled to mix it with beans, which form a part of the customary allowances previously spoken of. Still, we have chosen to give the above detailed account of the condition of the agricultural labourers in that province, because the able and careful report of the Pavian Chamber of Commerce may be accepted as true of those populations most afflicted by the scourge. Amid all the doubts which surround the subject and all the varieties of opinion which have been put forward by the great number of men of science who have given time and thought to the investigation of the disease, one thing stands out abundantly and painfully clear. The *pellagra* visits only the indigent and under-fed. This is absolutely certain and undisputed. The remedy which would within a very short space of time render the horrible disease as much a thing of the past as the 'black death' or the 'leprosy' is but too well known to every medical man who has ever dealt with it. A good ration of beef and wine administered every day to each patient, and each probable patient, would very soon put an end to it, and to all fear of its return! But aas! . . .

This knowledge would not, however, satisfy the medical enquirers who have made this malady their special study. Of course they are anxious to discover what is the immediate *causa causans* of this especial form of disease, in the hope that, inasmuch as all poverty, even the direst, does not produce *pellagra*, some remedy may be found less difficult of application

than that which has been mentioned. All indigent and half-starved men are not afflicted with *pellagra*. There are large communities of such persons among whom the disease has never been known. But all those attacked by *pellagra* are indigent and half starved.

Considering these facts, and casting about for a probable explanation of so special and peculiar a phenomenon, it struck the observers at a very early stage of their enquiries that the spread of *pellagra* in such proportions as to cause it to become a matter of national alarm was contemporaneous with the introduction into Italy on a large scale of maize or Indian corn, *Gran Turco*, or *frumentone*, as it is usually called in Italy; and a little further enquiry showed that the spread of the disease appeared to coincide locally with the spread of the maize cultivation. Hence the first hasty conclusion that the *pellagra* was caused by feeding on *Gran Turco*. But there were abundant instances of perfectly sound and healthy populations who used the *Gran Turco*. But not exclusively, replied the accusers of that plant. The *Gran Turco* produces *pellagra* in those who are fed upon it to the exclusion of any other aliment. A little fish, a little milk, a small quantity of green vegetables habitually added to the diet, are sufficient to prevent the result in question. An adequate portion of wine or spirits will have the same effect. The populations afflicted by *pellagra* are too poor to have many drunkards among them. But the few cases of drunkards which have been observed among these people are sufficient to show that the drunkard never suffers from *pellagra*. An exclusive diet of maize, then, has the effect of producing this fearful malady? But districts are to be found where this condition exists, yet the effect in question does not follow. Enquiries made among the hill districts to the north of the Lago di Garda have convinced us that many of the hill agricultural families live exclusively on maize, though no such disease as the *pellagra* was ever heard of in the district. Here, then, the enquirers were thrown back on fresh investigations and further consideration of the circumstances. And this led to the belief, now we imagine generally accepted, that the disease is produced by the use of maize in a deteriorated condition. It is pointed out that in many instances the *Gran Turco* does not fully and properly ripen in the north of Italy, while in the south it ripens perfectly, and there *pellagra* is not known. It is further shown that, even if the grain has been harvested fully ripe, it is often stored up damp, or so badly stored as to become damp from subsequent wetting. And it appears to

be proved that the grain in question is especially liable to rapid and serious deterioration from such causes. The lamentable account, which has been given in detail, of the condition of the Pavian peasant, has shown how frequently even in those cases in which the peasant's own grain is good, the flour which he is compelled to eat is bad. These combined facts have led to the conclusion that the *mould* developed by the *Gran Turco* during the process of fermentation from dampness contains a specific poison which produces *pellagra* in those who consume it. To this it was objected that the flour of *Gran Turco* in this deteriorated condition, however bad it might be, may be administered to the human subject without causing the slightest observable mischief or disturbance of any kind. The reply is that this poison, like many others, is fatal to a weakened, exhausted organism, though powerless against a vigorous and healthy one. And we thus reach the conclusion that *pellagra* is caused by the exclusive use of a diet of damaged Indian corn by persons in a poor and weak condition of body. If the diet is not exclusive of other substances, the result will not follow, as is shown by the absolute exemption of the miserable inhabitants of the cities in those very provinces which are most ravaged by the disease. If the maize be sound and of good quality, the result will not follow, as is shown by the entire exemption of many communities which use it exclusively. But all difficulty in the matter is not yet at an end. It has been asserted, as the reader of the foregoing pages has seen, that *pellagra* is believed to exist among populations where the use of maize is unknown! But, in the first place, every medical man knows how difficult is the task of pronouncing on the absolute identity of two cases of disease observed by different investigators. Much caution is necessary and much doubt justifiable before accepting as certain the statements of the existence of true *pellagra* where the *Gran Turco* is unknown. But, even granting that the disease, which has been observed among populations using no maize, is the true *pellagra*, it does not follow, because it is proved that the use of maize under certain conditions produces a certain disease, that nothing else can produce it. If it be shown that *pellagra* in certain places and under certain conditions may be produced by causes unconnected with the use of the *Gran Turco*, that does not necessarily invalidate the conclusion that, in the Italian provinces devastated by it, the true *causa causans* of the disease is the use of damaged maize as the exclusive diet of the afflicted populations. And, looking at the vast mass of evidence which has been brought to bear upon

the subject, and is arrayed in the volume we have been examining, it may be admitted as proved that this is the case.

We have sought, but have been unable to obtain, any trustworthy information as to the amount of return which capital invested in land produces in Italy, and especially in the provinces subjected to *pellagra*. It is stated in the volume before us, and, indeed, is well known, that these provinces are among the richest of all the agricultural districts of Italy. Probably they may be said to be among the richest in Europe. It is cursorily mentioned that these lands may be expected to yield about four per cent. on capital invested in the purchase of them. One would like to know, however, at what rent per acre the land is let in those cases—the majority—in which it is farmed. But this information we have been unable to get; it is not among the very numerous and multifarious facts collected by the statistical department of the Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce.

Doubtless if the proprietors of the lands on which these miserable populations exist in a condition which might more properly be called a living death, were interrogated on the subject, they would urge the crushing weight of taxation, which diminishes the value of their estates to a point leaving little for the labourer's share of the wealth which he produces. And certainly the amount of the tax on real property in Italy would appear very startling to our more fortunately circumstanced people. The tax in question differs very considerably in amount in the different provinces of the peninsula. This difference is, and is admitted to be, altogether unjust and unreasonable. It is the subject of continual complaint. But as the southern provinces are those which are most lightly taxed, and as the larger proportion of radical deputies comes from the south, there is not much hope of the equalisation of the incidence of taxation from a radical Government. The variation in the amount which real property pays to the State ranges from thirty to fifty per cent. Lombardy is among the more highly taxed regions. Now, one need not be prepared to admit that this tremendous taxation justifies the state of things disclosed in the foregoing pages, in order to perceive that it must very powerfully contribute to cause it. And it is equally evident that, of all the national expenditure of Italy, the sum which represents the cost of her huge army, is that which most fatally overweights her financial power and renders alleviation of this terrible taxation impossible. Thus we seem to arrive with fairly logical accuracy at the conclusion that the populations of the districts we have been con-

sidering are reduced to something very little better than cretinism, in order that Italy may have a strong army!

But now let us see, as some very interesting returns made to the Ministry of War enable us to do, how far such a method of proceeding achieves the results it aims at. The returns in question apply to the year 1877, and give the numbers of those in each province, who at the drawing for the conscription were rejected by the medical officers of the army as unfit for service by reason of their physical condition, together with the total number of the young men liable to the conscription that year. For the entire kingdom, the young men subjected to medical examination that year numbered 188,474; and of these the rejected (not including those below the standard of height, but only those disqualified by disease or deformity) amounted to 44,326. Now, observing the proportion which these two numbers bear to each other, we shall learn something from the following table:—

	Total Number	Rejected	Per Cent.
Piedmont	25,570	6,443	25·19
Lombardy	21,564	7,869	32·03
Venetia	16,812	4,442	26·42
Tuscany	15,388	3,180	23·75
Emilia	14,521	2,892	19·91
The Marches	6,470	1,400	22·56
Umbria	3,976	924	23·24
Rome (Province)	5,274	1,231	23·31
Naples (Province)	51,004	10,289	19·05
Sardinia	4,425	1,068	24·14
Sicily	19,472	4,528	23·25

It appears therefore that Lombardy, which comprises the greater part of the districts afflicted by the *pellagra*, offers to the recruiting officer a larger proportion of young men unfitted by their physical condition to serve in the army than any other province of the peninsula. And assuredly it is the richest, most fertile, and most productive. The difference between the number of lads rejected in Lombardy—more than 32 per cent., and the number similarly rejected in the ex-kingdom of Naples—only just over 19 per cent.—is enormous, and very striking. In the general spread of education, and in all that is commonly held to constitute civilisation, Lombardy is unquestionably far in advance of Naples. Yet the animal man seems to flourish with much greater vigour and health in Naples than in Lombardy! But in Naples the tax on real pro-

perty is much lighter than in Lombardy; and it seems impossible to shut one's eyes to the relation between these two facts. In fact, in those districts which are principally ravaged by the disease the race is rapidly and unmistakeably degenerating. And the evil is increasing. It is true that in some provinces a movement of amelioration has taken place; as, for instance, in the province of Como. But, turning to the replies to the question whether the wages of the agricultural population had increased, which, as mentioned above, was addressed by the Minister to the Prefects of all the provinces, we find the Prefect of Como stating that they have in his district been *doubled*; and it is there that the *pellagra* has diminished its ravages.

It would be easy to give from the volume we have been examining the numbers of those suffering, at the date it was compiled, from *pellagra*. But the notices taken from far more imperfect sources of the numbers existing at dates from fifty to twenty years ago are too fragmentary and uncertain to supply any general and accurate idea of the increase of the disease in the different localities. The mere reproduction of scattered and isolated facts would be very tedious to the reader without leaving him in possession of any adequate estimate of the general rate of the enemy's advance. It must suffice to state generally that in those localities in which it has most strongly established itself, it is still, despite all that modern science has as yet accomplished, increasing. To this it may be added—as the reader will probably deem sufficiently shown by the preceding pages—that, whatever conclusion medical science may arrive at as to the specific and immediate cause of the malady, the only real and efficacious remedy will be found to consist in the general amelioration of the unspeakably and disgracefully wretched condition of the agricultural labourers. The question, in other words, is, as regards its practical importance, not so much a medical as a social and economical one; and, of all the many questions belonging to the same category which are suggested to the student of political economy by the present condition of Italy, it is perhaps the most perplexing, and at the same time the most anxious and the most fearfully interesting.

ART. VII.—*Reminiscences of Thomas Carlyle*. Edited by JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE. Two vols. London: 1881.

A GRAVE in a humble kirkyard in Dumfriesshire has recently closed over the remains of one of the most eminent men of letters whom Scotland has produced in this century, to whose memory we are especially anxious to pay our tribute of personal respect and regard. For the earlier literary life of Thomas Carlyle was closely connected with this Journal. He had eaten of our salt; the oldest and most distinguished of our own predecessors had been the friend and adviser of a man whose genius Lord Jeffrey was one of the first to discern, although it was essentially unlike his own; and we may still say, without undue partiality, that Carlyle's contributions to the 'Edinburgh Review'—the article on 'Burns,'* the article entitled 'Signs of the Times,'† and the article entitled 'Characteristics,'‡ are not inferior to any of his later works, and may be said to contain the pith and marrow of them all, without the blemishes of a corrupt style and the paradoxes of an unsettled faith. It is, and will ever remain, the honour and glory of Thomas Carlyle that he contended without ceasing for what he termed the *dynamical* energy of the human soul in opposition to the tendencies of a *mechanical* age. His whole work was an indignant protest against the materialism of modern science, and an assertion of the spiritual dignity and duty of man. He poured forth a torrent of scorn and invective against the vulgar passions and motives which degrade society; he poured forth in a perpetual anthem his veneration for the higher powers to which he attached all that is noble, heroic, dutiful, and true in human life. This mode of thought, expressed in highly rhetorical and eccentric language, and enhanced by a strong northern dialect, a rugged aspect, and blunt manners, gave him the demeanour of a mystic, or, as some said, of a prophet. His influence over the younger generations of this century became considerable; his works, which had not found much acceptance when first written, became popular; and his authority has extended beyond the circulation of his writings. Doubtless, then, he proclaimed, or was supposed to proclaim, either some new truth to the world, or some old truth in a new and striking form. What was it?

Some fifty years ago, Mr. Carlyle addressed to a young man

* Ed. Rev. vol. xlviii. p. 267.

† Ib. vol. xlix. p. 439.

‡ Ib. vol. liv. p. 351.

of letters, then entering upon life, a brief letter couched in the following words—we have them now in writing before us—

‘ Remember now and always that life is no idle dream,
‘ but a solemn reality, based upon Eternity, and en-
‘ compassed by Eternity. Find out your task : stand to it :
‘ the night cometh when no man can work.’

This oracular lesson conveys all that is best in the faith and teaching of Carlyle. It is not new. It is not original. He himself repeats it in a thousand forms. But there is something in the grandeur and simplicity of the language which exalts the intellect and touches the heart. It is to such utterances as these that we ascribe whatever beneficial influence Mr. Carlyle has exerted on his times. Such lessons are not given in vain.

But when we proceed to a closer examination of his writings and his opinions, we confess that we are astonished at the exaggerated estimate which has been formed of them. Men are so much affected and amused by rhetoric, that they are tolerant even of its eccentricities, and of the paradoxes and falsehoods it may offer to them ; and if the present age with its immense literary activity has done but little for the permanent interests of literature, it is because we have wandered too far from the canons of simplicity and truth in pursuit of evanescent effects, metaphors, phantoms, and wild conceits. Many of the writings of Mr. Carlyle and Mr. Ruskin are what pantomime is to drama—what the music of Wagner is to the music of Mozart. Genius, no doubt, bursts forth from time to time from these pages in flashes of subterranean fire, but with a total want of control, completeness, and perfection. In this respect Mr. Carlyle was the antithesis of Goethe, for whom he professed so entire a veneration. For Goethe was a master of style, of clear-cut objective form. Carlyle is as formless as the heaving waves of the ocean. Nor was this his chief deficiency. He was singularly devoid of mental method and of logical power : not only he did not reason, but as one wave of incoherent sentiment succeeded another, he contradicted in one page what he had said just before. The great currents rooted in his life and character alone gave coherence and uniformity to his opinions. Much of his style might, without injustice, be said to consist of bad German translated into worse English, for he took for his model in composition not Goethe, but Jean Paul. The catch-words or quaint expressions which attracted attention, and were sometimes accepted as original and ingenious creations, were often mere German-

isms wrought into English. Thus, to take a recent example, everybody was amused when Mr. Carlyle denounced the 'unspeakable Turk,' whatever that might mean. Nobody before him had called a nation or a man 'unspeakable,' nor is the term appropriate. But the German word 'unaussprechlich' is in very common use to describe a thing excessive or monstrous. 'Unspeakable' was a mere translation of it. This Germanising habit is the more to be regretted, as Mr. Carlyle could, when he liked, write a very pure vernacular English, as we shall have occasion to prove from the posthumous volumes now before us. In exhorting his friend, John Sterling, to desist from writing poetry, he exclaimed: 'Beyond all ages, our age admonishes whatsoever thinking or writing man it has: Oh! speak to me some wise intelligible speech; your wise meaning *in the shortest and clearest way*; behold, I am dying for want of wise meaning and insight into the devouring fact: speak if you have any wisdom. The age itself, does it not, beyond most ages, demand and require a clear speech?' Unhappily the sage was ever unmindful of his own precept; his wisdom was often as obscure as the response of an oracle; and he did not often even condescend to utter it in his own mother tongue. One of his favourite dogmas was, that total unconsciousness is a sign and concomitant of genius. Was he altogether unconscious that in drawing the excellent portrait of Coleridge delivering one of his misty monologues (in the 'Life of Sterling'), and in describing the perturbed spirit of Professor Teufelsdröckh (in 'Sartor Resartus'), he was sketching from the life, and that the two beings resolved themselves into his own likeness? Another maxim was, that silence is the stamp of true greatness; yet no man ever lived who talked more incessantly or more at random.

Sir Henry Taylor described Mr. Carlyle many years ago as a 'Puritan who had lost his creed.' Nothing could be more terse, more accurate, or more true. The most potent element in his nature was his intense Scottish nationality. On this stock was originally engrafted the strict Cameronian creed. The creed vanished with the increasing doubts and soul-storms of later years, but the savage dogmatism of the Covenanter remained, drawing not only its language but its spirit from the old prophets of Israel, and utterly opposed to the humility, the resignation, the charity of a later and a purer faith. Of the three apostolic graces or gifts, Faith declined, Hope grew dim, but Charity vanished altogether. Mr. Carlyle's real opinions on religious subjects have for many years been unfathomable to us, and only to be traced by faint outward

manifestations; nor is this the place to discuss them. But, in justice to himself, we will quote a remarkable passage from the volumes now before us, which shows that he at least was not dissatisfied with the result. He speaks of the year he spent on a small farm at Hoddam Hill, in Dumfriesshire, as one of the least unsatisfactory of his life, 'lying now like a 'not ignoble russet-coated idyll in my memory.' He was then about thirty years of age. Of his state of mind at this place he writes thus:—

'This year I found that I had conquered all my scepticisms, agonising doubtings, fearful wrestlings with the foul and vile and soul-murdering Mud-gods of my epoch: had escaped as from a worse than Tartarus, with all its Phlegethons and Stygian quagmires, and was emerging free in spirit into the eternal blue of ether, where, blessed be heaven! I have for the spiritual part ever since lived, looking down upon the welterings of my poor fellow-creatures, in such multitudes and millions still stuck in that fatal element, and have had no concern whatever in their Puseyisms, ritualisms, metaphysical controversies and cobwebberies, and no feeling of my own except honest silent pity for the serious or religious part of them, and occasional indignation, for the poor world's sake, at the frivolous secular and impious part, with their universal suffrages, their Nigger emancipations, sluggard and scoundrel Protection societies, and "unexampled prosperities" for the time being! What my pious joy and gratitude then was, let the pious soul figure. In a fine and veritable sense, I, poor, obscure, without outlook, almost without worldly hope, had become independent of the world: What was death itself, from the world, to what I had come through? I understood well what the old Christian people meant by "*conversion*," by God's infinite mercy to them. I had, in effect, gained an immense victory, and for a number of years had, in spite of nerves and chagrins, a constant inward happiness that was quite royal and supreme, in which all temporal evil was transient and insignificant, and which essentially remains with me still, though far oftener *eclipsed* and lying deeper *down* than then. Once more, thank Heaven for its highest gift. I then felt, and still feel, endlessly indebted to Goethe in the business. He, in his fashion, I perceived, had travelled the steep rocky road before me, the first of the moderns.' (Vol. i. pp. 287, 288.)

How the study of Goethe had brought about this 'conversion' is one of the mysteries which are not disclosed to us, for assuredly Goethe was not the first of the moderns who had travelled the steep rocky road, and it appears to have led him to a barren height, on which he was content to sit in Olympian majesty. But it appears from this very passage that Goethe and his Scotch disciple were alike content to 'look down upon 'the weltering of their poor fellow-creatures,' in pity (not always silent) for the serious and religious part of them, and in occasional indignation at the rest of mankind. Hence Mr.

Carlyle was at war with all the tendencies of his own age, and all the social elements that surrounded him—the best as well as the worst. The spirit of enquiry and investigation was to him but another name for a disease of the human mind. What are ‘the Improvement of the Age, the Spirit of the Age, ‘Destruction of Prejudice, Progress of the Species, and the ‘march of Intellect, but an unhealthy state of self-sentience, self-survey; the precursor and prognostic of still worse health’? * All heroism, he said, departed from this country, if not from this earth, with the last of the Puritans in the seventeenth century. The whole life of society is carried on by drugs. All our institutions are shams. Parliamentary government is the worst of shams. The idea of government by the voice and will of numbers is a preposterous delusion. What is called ‘the ‘people’ is a multitude of fools. The only real ruler of men is the tyrant who has strength or cunning to grasp and retain supreme power. Slavery is a natural institution, since it is based on the evident superiority of the white race over the black. Force not only governs the world, but it absorbs and extinguishes the rights of those who presume to resist it. All these propositions may be found in Mr. Carlyle’s writings, or may fairly be deduced from them. They might serve as an apology for the most execrable forms of oppression. They are absolutely opposed to the spirit of freedom, to the active sympathies of humanity, and to the respect due to the independent opinions of the humble and the weak. It has ever been to us a matter of surprise that a writer, whose works are distinguished by principles more cynical than Mandeville, and more tyrannical than Hobbes, should be regarded with enthusiastic admiration by numbers of persons who profess advanced liberal opinions in this country, and even in the United States. The net result of Mr. Carlyle’s political opinions would seem to be that a government of Bismarcks or Gambettas is the perfection of statesmanship.

But whilst he made himself the apologist of despotism and absolutism on the one hand, he advanced to the extreme limit of destructive radicalism on the other. If, as he was wont to maintain, all the liberal institutions of this country and of civilisation itself are hollow impostures, lies, frauds, and inventions of the Evil One, the sooner they are cast out and destroyed the better. His philosophy, if he had a philosophy, was therefore essentially destructive; but if he were asked what he would erect on the ruins of society, his answer would

* ‘Characteristics,’ Ed. Review, vol. liv. p. 365.

be an heroic despot—a Cromwell, a Frederic II., perhaps a Robespierre. His types of heroic humanity were strangely chosen; they certainly were not the apostles of genuine liberty, unselfish duty, and a generous love of mankind. He could palliate the brutal buffoonery of Frederic William and the mendacity of Prussian ambition, as if he were utterly devoid of moral sense. People read these extravagances for their amusement, for we very much doubt whether Mr. Carlyle himself believed the paradoxes he uttered. But he had acquired a habit of saying startling things in a strange manner, and he heightened the effect of them by consigning to Tophet anybody who ventured to differ from him. These infirmities of temper had been greatly increased by the flattery lavished on him in his later years, which he swallowed with avidity; and he probably was not aware how singularly he exemplified in his own person the defects he had lashed most severely in others. We cannot think that Mr. Carlyle in his advance through life was a progressive character. Having known him fifty years ago, we can affirm that the simple-hearted dreamer, who came up from Craigenputtock to London in 1831, full of Novalis, Jean Paul, and Goethe, was a far more interesting and agreeable person than the sage of Cheyne Row in the latter half of this century. His opinions appear to have become more and more unfixed; his sense of the unfathomable mystery of existence, which hung on him with the weight of a nightmare, became more painful, his style more eccentric, and his treatment of all dissentient opinion more intolerant.

It was Mr. Carlyle's misfortune that he knew very little of the world and of society. He led the life of a recluse even in London, and he mistook for realities his own dyspeptic dreams. To him

'the world was an untrue, unblessed world . . . a world all rocking and plunging, like that old Roman one, when the measure of its iniquities was full; the abysses, and subterranean and supernal deluges, plainly broken loose; in the wild dim-lighted chaos all stars of Heaven gone out. No stars of Heaven visible, hardly now to any man; the pestiferous fogs and foul exhalations grown continual, have, except on the highest mountain tops, blotted out all the stars; will-o'-wisps, of various course and colour, take the place of stars. Over the wild surging chaos, in the leaden air, are only sudden glares of revolutionary lightning; then mere darkness with philanthropic phosphorescences, empty meteoric lights. Surely as mad a world as you could wish.' (*Life of John Sterling*, p. 220.)

This was Mr. Carlyle's opinion of the land he lived in in 1852. Is it a true opinion? Is it not a mere frantic piece of

rhetoric? Could a man be so blind or so miserable as to perceive nothing but this hideous desolation around him? Does any sane being suppose that this is a correct description of the state of society in this country?

It is not unnatural that the appearance of two men of letters in two successive centuries, who were both notorious for a certain rugged originality and vigour of intellect, should suggest a comparison between them. But the contrast between Dr. Johnson and Mr. Carlyle is more striking than the comparison: they differ far more than they agree. Johnson's style appears to us at present to be laborious and inflated, but it is always clear, demonstrative, and correct. His recorded observations on an infinite variety of subjects all bear the stamp of absolute good sense; scarcely one of Carlyle's judgments on men and things will bear that test. He saw them all through the coloured glasses of his own imagination; and even in the fine descriptive passages of his histories his own personality is obtrusively obvious. He lived and wrote as a man who has no external perceptions at all. Stripped of the peculiar form he gave them, most of his *sententie* are mere truisms as old as the hills, or untenable conceits and delusions.

In close connexion with this narrow range of his impressions was his total insensibility to every form of art. Of science he was not only ignorant but incurious; of art he was absolutely unconscious.* Music he disliked, painting he ignored; when taken to York to see the Minster, he sat down near the gate of the nave, and exclaimed, 'What for did the puir bodies 'pile up all these stones?' Here again, what a contrast with Goethe, who took the liveliest interest in every form of scientific truth and artistic beauty! The truth is that the early bent of Carlyle's life and education had *deformed* his mind.

* Mr. Carlyle's contempt for art was singularly characteristic of the intolerant spirit with which he regarded all the things of which he had no knowledge or feeling. When John Sterling was in Rome, his letters were full of enthusiastic artistic admiration of all he saw there. Carlyle treats this sentiment even in his friend with immeasurable scorn. 'It is expected in this nineteenth century that a man of culture 'shall understand and worship art,' he says; 'among the windy 'Gospels addressed to our poor century there are few louder than this 'of art. . . . Certainly of all subjects this was the one I cared least 'to hear even Sterling talk of; indeed it is a subject on which earnest 'men, abhorrent of hypocrisy and speech that has no meaning, are 'admonished to silence in this sad time.' All which only means that Thomas Carlyle knew nothing about art, and was incapable of appreciating it.

He had imagination, strength, and command of language for broad and noble views and works; but his life was spent for the most part in despondency and doubt; his range of thought was contracted to his own conceptions and sensations; and for a liberal survey of the wide field and scope of nature and of man his faculties failed him at last altogether. With strange inconsistency he will exclaim at one moment—

‘Truly it may be said the Divinity has withdrawn from the earth, or veils himself in that wide-wasting whirlwind of a departing era, wherein the fewest can discern his goings. Not Godhood, but an iron ignoble circle of necessity embraces all things; binds the youth of these times into a sluggish thrall or else exasperates him into a rebel. Heroic action is paralysed, for what worth now remains unquestionable with him?’

And then, ten pages further on in the same essay—

‘Truly everywhere the eternal fact begins again to be recognised that there is a godlike in human affairs; that God not only made us and beholds us, but is in us and around us; that the age of miracles, as it ever was, now is. . . . He that has an eye and a heart can even now say, “Why should I falter? Light has come into the world; “to such as love light, so as light must be loved, with a boundless all-doing, all-enduring love.”’

And the passage concludes with a magnificent exhortation to conquer and create uncreated and unconquered continents and Eldorados, since from the bosom of eternity shine for us celestial guiding stars.

Each of these paragraphs bears the stamp of Carlyle’s fervid eloquence; but placed side by side they absolutely contradict each other, and neither of them is rational or exactly true.

But our present object is not to review Mr. Carlyle’s works, or to attempt a close examination of his singular character. We cannot concur in the extravagant eulogies which have been addressed to his memory, but we retain a kindly recollection of much that was original, humorous, and striking in his conversation and his writings. And we turn the more readily to the volumes of his autobiographical recollections now before us, which were placed in the hands of Mr. Froude for publication immediately after his decease. If anybody supposes that the affectation of Mr. Carlyle’s style was inseparable from him, these volumes will prove the contrary. They are, for the most part, charming from the simplicity and grace of the language. The pictures of his early life are perfectly vivid and fresh. Except in his memoir of Mr. John Sterling Mr. Carlyle has nowhere left us so human a production. ‘To

'tell common things well' was said of old to be the test of good literary work; and the skill of the consummate artist imparts an interest and even a sort of glory to the daily task, the humble task of a Scottish peasant. It is true that in some of those peasants lay the germs of an immortal fire.

The first of these sketches was written in 1832, to retrace the character of Mr. Carlyle's own father, James Carlyle of Ecclefechan, mason, at the moment of his death. It was dictated by a genuine burst of filial piety, and the period at which it was written was that at which Carlyle's frame of mind and power of expression were, in our opinion, at their best. He himself speaks of this passage rather contemptuously in a later Reminiscence, written five-and-thirty years later (in 1867):—

'He had been in bed, as ill, only a few hours, when the last hour proved to be there, unexpectedly to all, except perhaps to himself; for ever since my sister Margaret's death he had been fast failing, though none of us took notice enough, such had been his perfection of health almost all through the seventy-three years he lived. I sat plunged in the depths of natural grief, the pale kingdoms of eternity laid bare to me, and all that was sad and grand and dark as death filling my thoughts exclusively day after day. How beautiful she was to me, how kind and tender! Till after the funeral my father's noble old face—one of the finest and strongest I have ever seen—was continually before my eyes. In these and the following days and nights I hastily wrote down some memorials of him, which I have never since seen, but which still exist somewhere; though, indeed, they were not worth preserving, still less are after I have done with them. "Posterity!" that is what I never thought of appealing to. What possible use can there be in appealing *there*, or in *appealing* anywhere, except by absolute silence to the High Court of Eternity, which can do no error, poetically transiencies that we are, coveting we know not what!' (Vol. i. pp. 317, 318.)

However this may be, the appeal to posterity has been made. These memorials were left prepared by the care of Mr. Froude for immediate publication on the death of the writer, and they are certainly one of the simplest and most sincere of Mr. Carlyle's works. Nothing, indeed, in his life did him more honour than the intense warmth of his domestic affections. He worshipped heroism, and by the force of imagination he invested those he loved with heroic qualities. James Carlyle becomes a glorified mason—the man of the largest intellect his son has ever known—a type of all that is noblest in human nature—a fervent burgher-Presbyterian, knowing no book at all but his Bible, but knowing that thoroughly, and living by his own light to the full stature of a *man*—a mighty

builder of dykes and stone bridges, 'perhaps among Scottish 'peasants what Samuel Johnson was among English authors'—but alas! *ultimus Romanorum*, he left not his fellow behind him. Nay, he is to be placed near to Burns himself.

'Burns, indeed, could have done nothing for him. As high a greatness hung over his world as over that of Burns—the ever-present greatness of the Infinite itself. Neither was he, like Burns, called to rebel against the world, but to labour patiently at his task there, uniting the possible with the necessary to bring out the real, wherein also lay an ideal. Burns could not have in any way strengthened him in this course; and therefore was for him a phenomenon merely. Nay, rumour had been so busy with Burns, and destiny and his own desert had in very deed so marred his name, that the good rather avoided him. Yet it was not with aversion that my father regarded Burns; at worst with indifference and neglect. I have heard him speak of once seeing him standing in "Rob Scott's smithy" (at Ecclefechan, no doubt superintending some work). He heard one say, "There is the "poet Burns." He went out to look, and saw a man with boots on, like a well-dressed farmer, walking down the village on the opposite side of the burn. This was all the relation these two men ever had; they were very nearly coevals. I knew Robert Burns, and I knew my father. Yet were you to ask me which had the greater natural faculty, I might perhaps actually pause before replying. Burns had an infinitely wider education, my father a far wholesomer. Besides, the one was a man of musical utterance; the other wholly a man of action, with speech subservient thereto. Never, of all the men I have seen, has one come personally in my way in whom the endowment from nature and the arena from fortune were so utterly out of all proportion. I have said this often, and partly know it. As a man of speculation—had culture ever unfolded him—he must have gone wild and desperate as Burns; but he was a man of conduct, and work keeps all right. What strange shapeable creatures we are!' (Vol. i. pp. 18, 19.)

Yet this remarkable individual was 'but half developed. 'We had all to complain that we durst not freely love him. His 'heart seemed as if walled in; he had not the free means to unbosom himself. It seemed as if an atmosphere of fear repelled 'us from him. To me it was especially so.' The silhouette of this redoubtable personage which is, oddly enough, prefixed to these volumes, is singularly coarse, sensual, and repulsive. Lavater would not have discovered in it the least touch of greatness. We suspect the chief merit of the mason was that he begat Thomas Carlyle and had him educated—a service his son never forgot.

The concluding lines of this sketch are touching:—

'As it is, I can think peaceably of the departed loved. All that was earthly, harsh, sinful in our relation has fallen away; all that was

holy in it remains. I can see my dear father's life in some measure as the sunk pillar on which mine was to rise and be built; the waters of time have now swelled up round his (as they will round mine); I can see it all transfigured, though I *touch* it no longer. I might almost say his spirit seems to have entered into me (so clearly do I discern and love him); I seem to myself only the continuation and second volume of my father. These days that I have spent thinking of him and of his end, are the peaceablest, the only Sabbath that I have had in London. One other of the universal destinies of man has overtaken me. Thank Heaven, I know and have known what it is to be a son; to love a father, as spirit can love spirit. God give me to live to my father's honour and to His. And now, beloved father, farewell for the last time in this world of shadows! In the world of realities may the Great Father again bring us together in perfect holiness and perfect love! Amen!' (Vol. i. pp. 65, 66.)

It is a striking proof of the force of Carlyle's literary power that he has given an abiding interest in these pages to the common incidents of the most homely life. He paints them as old Crome would paint a Norfolk heath or a stone quarry—the picture is not in the object, but in his own genius. Carlyle applied the same power to greater things. We are not of those who believe that he ever attained the rank of an historian, or that his later works have any historical value. But he was essentially picturesque. His personages are alive; his scenes are admirably put on the stage; he produces a dramatic effect.* That is probably the secret of his literary success. Every one of these mute inglorious peasants has a stamp of originality and of somewhat exaggerated truth. Times are changed, but there is still in Scotland many an honest God-fearing peasant or mason who might challenge a comparison with James Carlyle.

In spite of the originality which raised him from a very humble rank of life to celebrity, Mr. Carlyle cannot be said to have been a happy or a fortunate man. How much of his unhappiness or imperfect fortune lay in his own character, we shall not enquire. But the fact is that until he was considerably past thirty, or indeed near forty years of age, his genius and his literary attainments had obtained for him no recogni-

* In an article on the first volumes of his 'History of Frederic of Prussia,' which will be found in Vol. cx. of this Review, p. 376, we examined with care his merits as an historian. Our opinion of that work is unchanged, and we took no further notice of it. We observe with pleasure that General Sir Edward Hamley, in an admirable Essay which has recently been republished from 'Blackwood's Magazine,' expresses with great force the same views we ourselves entertain.

tion whatever. The most brilliant years of youth and early manhood were overshadowed to him by doubt as to his own vocation in life, by repugnance to the pursuits that lay before him, by dyspepsia which never left him, by despondency, by penury which only relaxed its iron grasp in his later years, and by disappointments more frequent than success. These adverse circumstances probably gave a cynical turn to a disposition naturally gloomy. We cannot discover in these Reminiscences that he ever learned to make the best of anything or to look on any event in his life from the cheerful side. His humour, indeed, seldom failed him, but it was a grim humour, which, like the wit of Swift, seemed to take a fierce delight in the laceration and misery of his own species. Yet, unlike Swift, he was, as we have said, capable of strong domestic affections and of friendship. From these two sources sprang twin influences which shed a beam of light upon his sombre path: the one his strong friendship for Edward Irving, the other his passionate attachment to his wife. Both are fitly commemorated in these volumes, and indeed impart to them their chief interest.

Irving's parents lived near the Carlyles in Annandale, and were of their acquaintance. Many a time these two boys, afterwards so closely connected, had sat together in the little chapel of Seceders at Ecclefechan; but Edward Irving (being the elder) left the school at Annan before Carlyle went there in 1806. He reappeared there on a visit to his old teacher, Adam Hope, in 1808, 'in a black coat and light pantaloons; clerically black his prevailing hue; and looking 'very neat, self-possessed, and enviable.' To Carlyle his life at school was, as most things were, 'doleful and hateful;' but in time he too removed to Edinburgh, read in the divinity hall a Latin thesis '*Num detur religio naturalis?*' and even preached a sermon on the text, 'Before I was afflicted I went 'astray,' &c. Just before this, he became, by competition, mathematical master in Annan Academy, for Carlyle had some proficiency in mathematics, and six years more of this life were to bring him to the church gate and make him a Scottish minister. Unluckily both branches of his situation and prospects were flatly contradictory to all ideals or wishes of his; neither schoolmaster nor minister was in Thomas Carlyle; he hated both more and more, 'and at the end my solitary desperate conclusion was fixed, that I, for my own part, would prefer to 'perish in the ditch, if necessary, than continue living by such 'a trade, and peremptorily gave it up accordingly.' We are not told what his poor father thought of this determination, who,

doubtless, had educated him with the fervent hope of seeing and hearing his eloquent son preach the Word. But this was after his experience of two years in Annan and two in Kirkcaldy.

It has always been to us a subject of amazement by what caprice of fate these two grim pedagogues, Irving and Carlyle, were sent to preside over the studies of the little boys of Kirkcaldy, and what the little boys thought of their pedagogues. There are still gruesome stories of that strange schooling handed down in the ancient borough; but of these we say nothing. It was in 1816 that Carlyle removed to the school of Kirkcaldy, partly as a rival to Irving himself. But Irving received him with the utmost cordiality, and for once Carlyle draws a pleasing picture of his new life, though it was soon to be abandoned.

‘George Irving, Edward’s youngest brother (who died in London as M.D., beginning practice about 1833), had met me as he returned from his lessons, when I *first* came along the street of Kirkcaldy on that sunny afternoon (August 1816), and with blithe looks and words had pointed out where his brother lived—a biggish, simple house on the sands. The *when* of my first call there I do not now remember, but have still brightly in mind how exuberantly good Irving was; how he took me into his library, a rough, littery, but considerable collection—far beyond what I had—and said, cheerily flinging out his arms, “Upon all these you have will and waygate,” an expressive Annandale phrase of the completest welcome, which I failed not of using by-and-by. I also recollect lodging with him for a night or two nights about that time. Bright moonshine; waves all dancing and glancing out of window, and beautifully humming and lullabying on that fine long sandy beach, where he and I so often walked and communed afterwards. From the first we honestly liked one another and grew intimate, nor was there ever, while we both lived, any cloud or grudge between us, or an interruption of our feelings for a day or hour. Blessed conquest of a friend in this world! That was mainly all the wealth I had for five or six years coming, and it made my life in Kirkcaldy (i.e. till near 1819, I think) a happy season in comparison, and a genially useful. Youth itself—healthy, well-intending youth—is so full of opulences. I always rather like Kirkcaldy to this day. Annan the reverse rather still when its *queuseries* come into my head, and my solitary quasi-enchanted position among them—unpermitted to kick them into the sea.

‘Irving’s library was of great use to me; Gibbon, Hume, etc. I think I must have read it almost through. Inconceivable to me now with what ardour, with what greedy velocity, literally above ten times the speed I can now make with any book. Gibbon, in particular, I recollect to have read at the rate of a volume a day (twelve volumes in all); and I have still a fair recollection of it, though seldom looking

into it since. It was, of all the books, perhaps the most impressive on me in my then stage of investigation and state of mind. I by no means completely admired Gibbon, perhaps not more than I now do; but his winged sarcasms, so quiet and yet so conclusively transpiercing and killing dead, were often admirable potent and illuminative to me. Nor did I fail to recognise his great power of investigating, ascertaining, grouping, and narrating; though the latter had always, then as now, something of a Drury Lane character, the colours strong but coarse, and set off by lights from the side scenes. On Irving's shelves were the small Didot French classics in quantity. With my appetite sharp, I must have read of French and English (for I don't recollect much classicality, only something of mathematics in intermittent spasms), a great deal during those years.

Irving himself, I found, was not, nor had been, much of a reader; but he had, with solid ingenuity and judgment, by some briefer process of his own, fished out correctly from many books the substance of what they handled, and of what conclusions they came to. This he possessed, and could produce in an "honest" manner, always when occasion came. He delighted to hear me give accounts of my reading, which were often enough a theme between us, and to me as well a profitable and pleasant one. He had gathered by natural sagacity and insight, from conversation and enquiry, a great deal of practical knowledge and information on things extant round him, which was quite defective in me the recluse. We never wanted for instructive and pleasant talk while together. He had a most hearty, if not very refined, sense of the ludicrous; a broad genial laugh in him always ready. His wide just sympathies, his native sagacities, honest-heartedness, and good humour, made him the most delightful of companions. Such colloquies and such roving about in bright scenes, in talk or in silence, I have never had since.' (Vol. i. pp. 100-104.)

The descriptions of the rambles of these young men along the shores of Fife, to the Highland lochs, and to Inchkeith are charming. The voyage to Inchkeith was made in 'Robin Greg's' poor green-painted rickety yawl, to intercept some outward-bound big ship. Little chance of that. So they landed on a wild stony little bay, and went to see the lighthouse.

'The scene in our little bay, as we were about proceeding to launch our boat, seemed to me the beautifullest I had ever beheld. Sun about setting just in face of us, behind Ben Lomond far away. Edinburgh with its towers; the great silver mirror of the Frith girt by such a framework of mountains; cities, rocks and fields and wavy landscapes on all hands of us; and reaching right untrler foot, as I remember, came a broad pillar as of gold from the just sinking sun; burning axle as it were going down to the centre of the world! But we had to bear a hand and get our boat launched, daylight evidently going to end by-and-by. Kirkcaldy was some five miles off, and probably the tide not in our favour. Gradually the stars came out, and

Kirkcaldy crept under its coverlid, showing not itself but its lights. We could still see one another in the fine clear grey, and pulled along what we could. We had no accident; not the least ill-luck. Donaldson, and perhaps Irving too I now think, wore some air of anxiety. I myself by my folly felt nothing, though I now almost shudder on looking back. We leapt out on Kirkcaldy beach about eleven P.M., and then heard sufficiently what a misery and tremor for us various friends had been in.' (Vol. i. pp. 112-113.)

Here it was that poor Irving fell into the snares of a certain Miss Martin, daughter of the minister at Kirkcaldy (of whom Carlyle draws a hideous picture), and soon ended in making her his wife. There was, indeed, about that time another young lady of very different character and attractions, inclined to look with favour on Irving, who certainly did not choose the better part; and this was Miss Jane Welsh, who afterwards became Mrs. Carlyle. It has been said that Irving jilted her; but there is no reference to this passage in our 'Reminiscences;' it may be wholly untrue, and certainly no tinge of jealous rivalry on either side interfered with the friendship of Irving and her future husband.

We cannot accompany these young men in their summer excursions, which were continued even after Irving had left Kirkcaldy to enter upon the duties of the ministry in Glasgow, where he was already remarked as a preacher of great power and originality. But the following sketch of a conversation on Drumclog Moss is so striking, that it must find a place here. Probably since the days of the Covenanters nothing so curious had occurred on that spot, for there it was that, so to speak, Carlyle *uncovenanted* himself to Irving.

'Drumclog Moss (after several hours fallen vacant and wholly dim) is the next object that survives, and Irving and I sitting by ourselves under the silent bright skies among the "peat-hags" of Drumclog with a world all silent round us. These peat-hags are still pictured in me; brown bog, all pitted and broken into heathy remnants and bare abrupt wide holes, four or five feet deep, mostly dry at present; a flat wilderness of broken bog, of quagmire not to be trusted (probably wetter in old days there, and wet still in rainy seasons). Clearly a good place for Cameronian preaching, and dangerously difficult for Claverse and horse soldiery if the suffering remnant had a few old muskets among them! Scott's novels had given the Claverse skirmish here, which all Scotland knew of already, a double interest in those days. I know not that we talked much of this; but we did of many things, perhaps more confidentially than ever before. A colloquy the sum of which is still mournfully beautiful to me, though the details are gone. I remember us sitting on the brow of a peat-hag, the sun shining, our own voices the one sound. Far, far away to the westward over our brown horizon, towered up white and visible at the many

miles of distance a high irregular pyramid. "Ailsa Craig," we at once guessed, and thought of the seas and oceans over yonder. But we did not long dwell on that. We seem to have seen no human creature after French (though of course our very road would have to be enquired after); to have had no bother and no need of human assistance or society, not even of refectation, French's breakfast perfectly sufficing us. The talk had grown ever friendlier, more interesting. At length the declining sun said plainly, you must part. We sauntered slowly into the Glasgow-Muirkirk highway. Masons were building at a wayside cottage near by, or were packing up on ceasing for the day. We leant our backs to a dry stone fence ("stone dike," dry stone wall, very common in that country), and looking into the western radiance, continued in talk yet a while, loth both of us to go. It was just here, as the sun was sinking, Irving actually drew from me by degrees, in the softest manner, the confession that I did not think as he of the Christian religion, and that it was vain for me to expect I ever could or should. This, if this was so, he had pre-engaged to take well of me, like an elder brother, if I would be frank with him. And right loyally he did so, and to the end of his life we needed no concealments on that head, which was really a step gained.' (Vol. i. pp. 177-179.)

Irving was still in the genial period of his life—'quiet, cheerful, soul-unruffled, and clear as a mirror.' If this be true, how strange was the metamorphosis when 'a few years after ruin's ploughshare had run through it all and it was prophesying to you, "Behold, in a little while the last trace of me will not be here, and I shall have vanished tragically and fled into oblivion and darkness like a bright dream."' At this time Irving was Carlyle's consoler.

'Our dialogues did not turn very much or long on personal topics, but wandered wide over the world and its ways—new men of the travelling conspicuous sort whom he had seen in Glasgow, new books sometimes, my scope being short in that respect; all manner of interesting objects and discoursings; but to me the personal, when they did come in course, as they were sure to do now and then in fit proportion, were naturally the gratefullest of all. Irving's voice was to me one of blessedness and new hope. He would not hear of my gloomy prognostications; all nonsense that I never should get out of these obstructions and impossibilities; the real impossibility was that such a talent, etc., should not cut itself clear one day. He was very generous to everybody's "talent," especially to mine; which to myself was balefully dubious, nothing but bare scaffold poles, weatherbeaten corner-pieces of perhaps a "potential talent," even visible to me. His predictions about what I was to be flew into the completely incredible; and however welcome, I could only rank them as devout imaginations and quiz them away. "You will see now," he would say, "one day we two will shake hands across the brook, you as first in literature, I as first in divinity, and people will say, 'Both these fellows are from Annandale. Where is Annandale?'" This I have heard him say

more than once, always in a laughing way, and with self-mockery enough to save it from being barrenly vain. He was very sanguine, I much the reverse; and had his consciousness of power, and his generous ambitions and forecastings. Never ungenerous, never ignoble; only an enemy could have called him vain, but perhaps an enemy could or at least would, and occasionally did. His pleasure in being *loved* by others was very great, and this if you looked well was manifest in him when the case offered; never more or worse than this in any case, and this too he had well in check at all times. If this was vanity, then he might by some be called a little vain, if not not. To trample on the smallest mortal or be tyrannous even towards the basest of caitiffs was never at any moment Irving's turn. No man that I have known had a sunnier type of character, or so little of hatred towards any man or thing. On the whole, *less* of rage in him than I ever saw combined with such a fund of courage and conviction. Noble Irving! he was the faithful elder brother of my life in those years; generous, wise, beneficent, all his dealings and discoursings with me were. Well may I recollect as blessed things in my existence those Annan and other visits, and feel that beyond all other men he was helpful to me when I most needed help.' (Vol. i. pp. 187-189.)

Soon afterwards Irving removed to London, where he took charge of the Scottish Kirk in Hatton Garden, and began that wild course of pulpit popularity which turned him at last into a mountebank or a madman. We confess that we have not so high an opinion of his sincerity as Carlyle continued to retain; and even he at last had misgivings. Certainly, of all Irving's predictions, that in which he forecast the future fame of 'both these fellows from Annandale' is one of the most daring, and that which has been most nearly fulfilled.

Meanwhile Irving in London did not forget his friend. He found an opportunity to recommend Carlyle to Mrs. Buller, through her sister Mrs. Strachey, as a tutor to her sons Charles and Arthur Buller, boys of fifteen or twelve, then leaving Harrow, and not yet ripe for Cambridge. This was in 1822. If anything could win a man back to more kindly views of life, it would be the company of a high-spirited, droll, and amiable lad like Charles Buller; and this employment had a favourable influence on Carlyle, especially as it was backed by a liberal allowance of 200*l.* a year. The memory of Charles Buller dwells in the hearts of all who ever knew and loved him, with mingled feelings of mirth—for he was 'a fellow of infinite jest, of most excellent fancy'—and of sorrow for the abrupt and premature conclusion of a life which promised not only kindness and affection, but something of greatness. Carlyle was fortunate in his pupil:—

'From the first I found my Charles a most manageable, intelligent,

cheery, and altogether welcome and intelligent phenomenon; quite a bit of sunshine in my dreary Edinburgh element. I was in waiting for his brother and him when they landed at Fleming's. We set instantly out on a walk, round by the foot of Salisbury Crags, up from Holyrood, by the Castle and Law Courts, home again to George Square; and really I recollect few more pleasant walks in my life! So all-intelligent, seizing everything you said to him with such a recognition; so loyal-hearted, chivalrous, guileless, so delighted (evidently) with me, as I was with him. Arthur, two years younger, kept mainly silent, being slightly deaf too; but I could perceive that he also was a fine little fellow, honest, intelligent, and kind, and that apparently I had been much in luck in this didactic adventure, which proved abundantly the fact. The two youths took to me with unhesitating liking, and I to them; and we never had anything of quarrel or even of weariness and dreariness between us; such "teaching" as I never did in any sphere before or since! Charles, by his qualities, his ingenuous curiosities, his brilliancy of faculty and character, was actually an entertainment to me rather than a labour. If we walked together, which I remember sometimes happening, he was the best company I could find in Edinburgh. I had entered him of Dunbar's, in third Greek class at college. In Greek and Latin, in the former in every respect, he was far my superior; and I had to prepare my lessons by way of keeping him to his work at Dunbar's. Keeping him to work was my one difficulty, if there was one, and my essential function. I tried to guide him into reading, into solid enquiry and reflection. He got some mathematics from me, and might have had more. He got in brief what expansion into such wider fields, of intellect and more manful modes of thinking and working, as my poor possibilities could yield him; and was always generously grateful to me afterwards. Friends of mine in a fine frank way, beyond what I could be thought to merit, he, Arthur, and all the family continued till death parted us.' (Vol. i. pp. 197-198.)

The beneficial influence of this engagement on Carlyle was not confined to his intercourse with his youthful but very charming pupils. It introduced him for the first time to the society of persons of station, education, and refinement, of which till then he had not the least idea. Hitherto he had looked up to the judges, the advocates, the professors, whom he saw in the Parliament House or the schools of Edinburgh, as beings enthroned in unapproachable majesty, whom he regarded with proud dislike, conscious that he had little in common with their mode of life, although his attainments might be equal, his genius far superior, to theirs. No step in life is more difficult or more discouraging to a man of high aspirations, but of lowly position, than that which takes him into a class far above his own. It was his fortunate connexion with the Bulls and the Stracheys that brought Carlyle into English society, from

which, however he might disparage and abuse it, he continued throughout the remainder of his life to receive unwearied kindness and abundant benefits. Carlyle was wont to preach loudly the virtues of self-reliance and independence; but in truth no man was ever more deeply indebted to the services of others or drew more largely upon them, although he honestly professed a noble indifference to the gifts of fortune, and seems never to have accepted a pecuniary obligation from any man. With reference to his introduction to the higher and more cultivated classes of society, Carlyle admits, fairly enough, that 'something of snob ambition there might be in him' which, he hoped, was not much, though for certain it was 'not quite wanting either;' and to this remark he adds, with more of grace and gratitude than is usual with him:—

'On the whole, that too was a thing to be gone through in our career; and it had its bits of benefits, bits of instructions, &c., &c.; but also its temptations, intricacies, tendencies to vanity, &c., to waste of time and faculty; and in a better sphere of arrangement, would have been a "game not worth the candle." Certain of the Aristocracy, however, did seem to me still very noble; and, with due limitation of the grossly worthless (none of whom had we to do with), I should vote at present that, of classes known to me in England, the Aristocracy (with its perfection of human politeness, its continual grace of bearing and of acting, steadfast "honour," light address and cheery stoicism), if you see well into it, is actually yet the best of English classes. Deep in it we never were, promenaders on the shore rather; but I have known it too, and formed deliberate judgment as above.' (Vol. ii. p. 190.)

In 1824 he came with the young Bulls to London for the first time. The house of his friend Irving gladly received him, and he was soon launched in a most congenial circle, though he says that his 'own situation was very wretched,' and that he only fought his 'sore and hopeless battle with the 'obstinaey of ten mules.' Barring 'the accursed hag Dys-pepsia,' we do not see what he had to complain of, considering his point of departure, and the fair progress in life he had already made. It is true that his engagement with the Bulls came to an end, 'as intolerable and useless both.' Charles went to Cambridge, and Carlyle, not having as yet 'found out 'his task,' had nothing to do. Upon which he goes off to spend two or three months with some hospitable friends, named Badams, at Birmingham.

The sketches he has left behind him of his new acquaintances in London and Warwickshire are lively and amusing enough, for he hits off a character like a caricaturist with a

grotesque touch of his pen. But of all these good people not one escapes an incision from his satirical scalpel. Indeed, throughout the book scarcely a person is named, except his own family, to whom he does not affix some scornful and opprobrious epithet. We shall not quote or repeat these sayings. Carlyle probably wrote them down for his own amusement; but there is a sting in every one of them, and nothing is less to be desired than to be handed down to posterity in Mr. Carlyle's '*Reminiscences*.'

Amongst the houses in London to which Irving had introduced him, none was more attractive than that of Mr. Basil Montagu, and in none was he better received. We pass over the unpleasant things he contrives to say of several members of this gifted family, but we dwell with pleasure on the portrait of the mistress of that house, called by Irving 'the noble lady,' who was in fact one of the most admirable and remarkable of women.

'Ruling such a miscellany of a household, with Basil Montagu at the head, and an almost still stranger miscellaneous society that fluctuated through it, Mrs. Montagu had a problem like few others. But she, if anyone, was equal to it. A more constant and consummate artist in that kind you could nowhere meet with; truly a remarkable and partly a high and tragical woman; now about fifty, with the remains of a certain queenly beauty which she still took strict care of. A tall, rather thin figure; a face pale, intelligent, and penetrating; nose fine, rather large, and decisively Roman; pair of bright, not soft, but sharp and small black eyes, with a cold smile as of enquiry in them; fine brow; fine chin (both rather prominent); thin lips—lips always gently shut, as if till the enquiry were completed, and the time came for something of royal speech upon it. She had a slight Yorkshire accent, but spoke—Dr. Hugh Blair could not have picked a hole in it—and you might have printed every word, so queenlike, gentle, soothing, measured, prettily royal towards subjects whom she wished to love her. The voice was modulated, low, not inharmonious; yet there was something of metallic in it, akin to that smile in the eyes. One durst not quite love this high personage as she wished to be loved! Her very dress was notable; always the same, and in a fashion of its own; kind of widow's cap fastened below the chin, darkish puce-coloured silk all the rest, and (I used to hear from one who knew!) was admirable, and must have required daily the fastening of sixty or eighty pins.

'There were many criticisms of Mrs. Montagu—often angry ones; but the truth is she did love and aspire to human excellence, and her road to it was no better than a steep hill of jingling boulders and sliding sand. There remained therefore nothing, if you still aspired, but to succeed ill and put the best face on it. Which she amply did. I have heard her speak of the Spartan boy who let the fox hidden

under his robe eat him, rather than rob him of his honour from the theft.

'In early life she had made some visit to Nithsdale (to the "Craiks" of Airligsland"), and had seen Burns, of whom her worship continued fervent, her few recollections always a jewel she was ready to produce. She must have been strikingly beautiful at that time, and Burns's recognition and adoration would not be wanting; the most royally courteous of mankind she always defined him, as the first mark of his genius. I think I have heard that, at a ball at Dumfries, she had frugally constructed some dress by sewing real flowers upon it: and shone by that bit of art, and by her fine bearing, as the cynosure of all eyes.

Her sovereignty in the house had to be soft, judicious, politic, but it was constant and valid, felt to be beneficial withal. "She is like one in "command of a mutinous ship which is ready to take fire," Irving once said to me. By this time he had begun to discover that this "noble lady" was in essentially an artist, and hadn't perhaps so much loved him as tried to buy love from him by soft ministrations, by the skilfullest flattery liberally laid on. He continued always to look kindly towards her, but had now, or did by-and-by, let drop the old epithet. Whether she had done him good or ill would be hard to say; ill perhaps! In this liberal London, pitch your sphere one step lower than yourself, and you can get what amount of flattery you will consent to. Everybody has it, like paper money, for the printing, and will buy a small amount of ware by any quantity of it. 'The generous Irving did not find out this so soon as some surlier fellows of us!' (Vol. i. pp. 226-230.)

Carlyle himself certainly contrived to extract no small amount of flattery in this liberal London from spheres not at all lower than himself, but, on the contrary, much above him. This remark, therefore, is not a just one.

In the following year Carlyle left London, a trip to Paris with the Stracheys having occurred in the interval. His 'Life of Schiller,' which had first appeared in the 'London Magazine,' was published separately, and he got 100*l.* for it—no bad price for the first work of an unknown author. He then returned to Scotland, and in 1826 he married Miss Jane Welsh, to whom he had long been attached, and of whom we shall have occasion to say more presently. The young couple soon established themselves at Craigenputtoch, a small farm in the Dumfriesshire hills which belonged to Mrs. Carlyle's family; and there for seven years they led a life of almost unbroken solitude, happy in an ardent affection for each other, contented with a crust, though aspiring to better things, and ever more and more devoted to German literature and German modes of thought and forms of language. Carlyle's extreme Germanism dates from this period, and perhaps the

favour Goethe had shown to his 'Life of Schiller' had something to do with it. He had not visited Germany, and at that time his knowledge of the German language was by no means accurate; though he translated 'Wilhelm Meister,' and various tales from German writers. But if Goethe became the object of his idolatry, Jean Paul and Novalis had the strongest effect on his own style. Here, too, he composed his 'Sartor Resartus,' a work no doubt of great singularity and power (first published in 'Fraser's Magazine'), but so entirely written in the spirit and language of Jean Paul, that it might pass for a travesty of that eccentric writer.

'It looks to me now like a kind of humble russet-coated *epic*, that seven years' settlement at Craigenputloch, very poor in this world's goods but not without an intrinsic dignity greater and more important than then appeared; thanks very mainly to her, and her faculties and magnanimities, without whom it had not been possible. I incline to think it the poor *best* place that could have been selected for the ripening into fixity and composure of anything useful which there may have been in me against the years that were coming. And it is certain that for living in and thinking in, I have never since found in the world a place so favourable. And we were driven and pushed into it, as if by necessity, and its beneficent though ugly little shocks and pushes, shock after shock, gradually compelling us thither! "For a divinity doth "shape our ends, rough hew them how we may." Often in my life have I been brought to think of this, as probably every considering person is; and looking before and after, have felt, though reluctant enough to believe in the importance or significance of so infinitesimally small an atom as oneself, that the doctrine of a special providence is in some sort natural to man. All piety points that way, all logic points the other; one has in one's darkness and limitation a trembling faith, and can at least with the *voices* say, "*Wir heissen euch hoffen*," if it be the will of the Highest. (Vol. ii. pp. 31-32.)

It was about this time, too, that Carlyle was introduced, by a letter from Mr. Procter (Mrs. Basil Montagu's son-in-law), to Mr. Jeffrey, then the leader of the Scottish bar and the editor of this Review. The literary society of Edinburgh was still brilliant. Scott, Wilson, Hogg, Lockhart, Playfair, Cockburn were amongst us, and amongst these men of wit and genius Jeffrey held no inconsiderable place. Carlyle had long watched his career at the bar with interest, though his own moral sense could not approve the talent which makes the best of bad causes and rescues atrocious criminals from the punishment they have deserved. His sketch of Jeffrey at the bar brings the man before us.

'I was always glad to notice him when I strolled into the courts, and eagerly enough stepped up to hear if I found him pleading; a

delicate, attractive, dainty little figure, as he merely walked about, much more if he were speaking; uncommonly bright black eyes, instinct with vivacity, intelligence, and kindly fire; roundish brow, delicate oval face full of rapid expression, figure light, nimble, pretty though so small, perhaps hardly five feet in height. He had his gown, almost never any wig, wore his black hair rather closely cropt; I have seen the back part of it jerk suddenly out in some of the rapid expressions of his face, and knew even if behind him that his brow was then puckered, and his eyes looking archly, half contemptuously out, in conformity to some conclusive little cut his tongue was giving. His voice, clear, harmonious and sonorous, had something of metallic in it, something almost plangent; never rose into alt, into any dissonance or shrillness, nor carried much the character of humour, though a fine feeling of the ludicrous always dwelt in him—as you would notice best when he got into Scotch dialect, and gave you with admirable truth of mimicry, old Edinburgh incidents and experiences of his—very great upon old “Judge Braxie,” “Peter Peebles” and the like. For the rest his laugh was small and by no means Homeric; he never laughed loud (could not do it, I should think) and indeed oftener sniggered slightly than laughed in any way.

‘For above a dozen or fourteen years I had been outwardly familiar with the figure of Jeffrey before we came to any closer acquaintance, or indeed, had the least prospect of any. His sphere lay far away above mine; to him in his shining elevation my existence down among the shadows was unknown.’ (Vol. ii. pp. 13–15.)

Jeffrey received Carlyle with his usual kindness, and his acute penetration was not slow to discover that he had before him a man of genius, struggling with narrow circumstances and an unsettled position in life, full of ambition, and encrusted with German ideas and a German style, essentially opposed to those of the Scottish advocate and editor. For Jeffrey had much more of the French turn of thought than the Teutonic. Carlyle calls him ‘a potential Voltaire,’ which is, as usual, an exaggeration; but he undoubtedly leaned to the philosophy of the Encyclopédistes and the eighteenth century, and he delighted in precise thought, clear diction, and definite meaning. These were not the qualities of Carlyle. The more creditable was it that Jeffrey sought on every possible occasion to assist Carlyle in his literary career, or, as he expressed it, ‘to give him a lift.’ He opened to him the pages of this Review. Charles Sumner once asked Lord Jeffrey why Carlyle’s article on Burns was so superior in style to anything he ever wrote afterwards. The answer was that Jeffrey had revised it with more than editorial care, an attention Carlyle could not easily forgive. It would have been as easy to wash an Ethiopian white as to convert Carlyle to the familiar and classical language of English literature.

Trahit sua quemque voluptas. Carlyle's own account of the matter is that Jeffrey seemed 'bent, first of all, on converting me back from what he called my German mysticism—back 'merely, as I could perceive, into dead Edinburgh Whiggism, 'scepticism, and materialism, which I felt to be a for ever impossible enterprise.' This was in 1828. We might venture to reply that Edinburgh Whiggism had then, and still has, some power in the world; that in scepticism Carlyle was at least as far advanced as Lord Jeffrey, since he had avowedly repudiated the religion of his forefathers; and that materialism has never been the creed of Scotch philosophers. But Jeffrey's kindness to Carlyle was not of the proselytising kind. He invited him to stay at Craigerook. He visited him (oh! rash adventure) at Craigenputtoch, where Mrs. Carlyle made the pancakes. He offered to settle on him an annuity of 100*l.*, which Carlyle bluntly but honourably refused; and he continued, in spite of their absolute differences of opinion and manners, to keep up a close intimacy with the recluse, as an enormous correspondence is still in existence to testify. Indeed, if we are not misinformed, the tone of Carlyle in his letters both to Lord Jeffrey and to Mr. Basil Montagu and his family was essentially unlike that of these 'Reminiscences.'

We would not undertake to say how much of all this profuse kindness was meant for Carlyle and how much for his wife. Lord Jeffrey, though already advanced in life, was extremely fond of the society of pretty and intelligent women; Mrs. Carlyle was infinitely more cheerful and attractive to a man of gallantry than her husband, and in fact *her* correspondence with the Scotch Lord of Session (as he afterwards became) continued after that of Carlyle dropped. For the intimacy came to an end in this wise. Whilst Jeffrey was Lord Advocate a place fell vacant in the Edinburgh Observatory, which was in his gift. Carlyle, who knew something of mathematics, but who confesses he had hardly even looked through a telescope, asked for the appointment. Jeffrey flatly and vehemently declined, for, however addicted Carlyle may have been to stargazing, he was no more fit to be a regular astronomer than to be a judge of the Court of Session. But the refusal was resented. The friendship came to an end, and we suppose left some bitterness behind it; for, in spite of all the kindness he had previously received from Jeffrey, when he had no other friends, Carlyle turns upon him in these 'Reminiscences' with a degree of malignity not commonly addressed even to benefactors. His crime was, it seems, not to be 'deep,' and Carlyle is pleased to embrace in his maledictions this Journal for its frightfully

democratic tendencies. 'Democracy,' he says, 'the gradual 'uprise and rule of all things of roaring million-headed, unreflecting, darkly-suffering, darkly-sinning "Demos" come to call 'its old superiors to account at its maddest of tribunals; nothing 'in my time has so forwarded all this as Jeffrey and his once 'famous "Edinburgh Review."' Whatever may have been the failings of Lord Jeffrey, or of the Journal with which he was so long connected, we need scarcely enter our protest against this ridiculous and monstrous accusation—the more absurd that it proceeds from the writer of the 'Latter-day 'Pamphlets' and the 'History of the French Revolution.' Carlyle, whenever he approached the domain of politics, broke out into destructive radicalism, or prostrated himself before arbitrary power. Of free institutions, of liberty controlled by law, of the steady progress of reform, and the slow but real growth of popular power, he had no conception, and we are not surprised that he has left on record his anathema against the principles of this Review. They certainly are entirely opposed to his own. But that is no reason that he should have endeavoured in these 'Reminiscences' to throw ridicule and contempt on one of his first patrons and his oldest friends. The attempt will probably do more to discredit the heart of Carlyle than the head of Lord Jeffrey. He speaks in equally contemptuous and offensive language of Mr. Empson, Lord Jeffrey's son-in-law and successor in the editorial chair, a man endeared to all his acquaintance by his amiable character and his high culture. Did Mr. Carlyle foresee that the daughter of Jeffrey and the widow of Empson would survive himself and read these ungracious words?

We have now reached a portion of this work of which we would willingly say but little, but it cannot be passed over in silence. The larger portion of the second volume is devoted by Mr. Carlyle to a lamentation over the death of his wife, and an attempt to delineate her character. It cannot be read without sympathy and emotion, for it was written under the influence of great and uncontrollable sorrow, soon after the event which had suddenly broken the dearest ties of affection, after a married life of forty years. Carlyle was induced by Lady Ashburton to spend the following winter at Mentone, in the kindly hope that new scenes and a more genial climate might assuage his grief. There it was that he committed to paper these reminiscences of her he had lost, more, no doubt, for the solace of his own feelings than with any view to the public exhibition of them. The deepest wounds are those which lie buried in the heart. Nevertheless it is clear that he

did contemplate the publication of these papers at some future time, and in giving them to the world immediately after his death. Mr. Froude has doubtless fulfilled Carlyle's own intentions. We must be permitted to say that we regret it, although no doubt these touching details will be read with interest. But they exhibit Carlyle's own character, in some respects, in an unfavourable light. If there is any piety in religion, if there is any strength in philosophy, if there is any manliness in a mind accustomed to dwell on the mysterious issues of life and death, it is on such an occasion as this that a man may be expected to show that his faith, his wisdom, and his mental discipline are not utterly void and vain. Events which wring the heart-strings, and from which, sooner or later, none of us can escape, are the tests of deep convictions and of self-command. Carlyle applies these tests to himself, and fails in the trial. His tribute to the memory of his wife is a continual wail over his own misfortune, not unmixed, it would seem, with twinges of self-reproach for not having respected and admired her as fully as she deserved whilst she was alive. He owed to her a great part of the happiness of his life, and his reflections on her death are all dictated by the sense of his own forlorn condition.

Love and grief cast a preternatural radiance over the past, like the last intense beam of light which the setting sun sometimes throws over the landscape. Theirs is the poetic power which centred round a Beatrice or a Laura, and exalted them to heaven. But these hallucinations are not confined to the dreams of great poets. We have seen them exercising the same influence over some of the keenest and most positive thinkers of our own day, and doubtless their effect has been the same in all time. John Stuart Mill conceived that he had found in Mrs. Taylor the highest qualities of human nature, a paragon among women, 'of all but unrivalled wisdom.*' Mr. Carlyle tells us that Mill introduced to them 'his Mrs. Taylor, a very will-o-wispish "iridescence" of a creature;' and that 'the Mrs. Taylor business was becoming more and more of questionable benefit to him (we could see), but on that subject we were strictly silent and he was pretty still.' Far be it from us to compare for a moment Mrs. Carlyle, who was a model of domestic propriety and virtue, with a person in the position of Mrs. Taylor. But the enthusiastic description of his wife which Mr. Carlyle has thought fit to bequeath to the world is, we believe, as far removed from simple

See Mill's dedication of his *Essay on Liberty*.

truth and reality as the language of Mr. Mill. Even Mr. Froude tells us in his preface that Carlyle's 'object was to 'leave a monument to a singularly gifted woman, who, had she 'so pleased, might have made a name for herself, and for his 'sake had voluntarily sacrificed ambition and fortune.'

We affirm with some confidence that the last person to desire this sort of notoriety was Mrs. Carlyle, and that she would have condemned to the flames an imaginary portrait of herself so deficient in actual resemblance. She was an admirable and devoted wife, whose buoyant and graceful nature threw over Carlyle's rugged and desponding existence whatever light and cheerfulness he would allow to reach him; and for forty years she fulfilled this difficult task. We have seldom known a more pleasing woman—*placens uxor*—that is the word that best describes her. Even in early life, soon after her marriage, she had no pretensions to beauty; but her bright eyes, her dark eyebrows, her winning smile, the dimple on her cheek, her arch look, her soft voice, her gaiety and elegance of manner, made her extremely attractive, and, as the Spaniards say, sympathetic. One would have said she was the very anti-type of Carlyle himself, yet perhaps this polarity of manner and disposition only united them the more closely. She laid no claim at all to 'singular gifts,' but she had a lively intelligence, a keen sense of humour, and a firmness of purpose concealed beneath a gentle demeanour, which Carlyle himself well described, in the epitaph he put upon her tomb at Haddington, as her 'soft invincibility.' Her task in life was not an easy one, and it was not rendered more easy by Carlyle himself, for, in spite of his affection and admiration for his wife, he was always exacting, and not always courteous. Having married a man considerably below her own station in life—for she had all the delicacy and refinement of a lady—and having accepted for his sake a position bordering on poverty, the whole burden of the domestic duties incident to a narrow income fell upon herself. She performed them without a complaint; but they consumed the greater part of her life. There is no harder task than to watch over the daily wants, real and imaginary, of a man of genius cursed with a bad digestion, intolerant of the slightest noise (for to Carlyle even the cocks and hens in his neighbour's yard were 'demon fowls'), irritated by contradiction, and of an atrabilious temperament. All this Mrs. Carlyle did and endured, and this is the true monument to her memory. The narrative of her daily efforts to carry on life under these conditions—of her bursts of pleasure at her husband's literary success, which came at last, though it came

late—of her joy when she emerged a little into society, for which she had a keen relish—and of the soothing influence she exercised over Carlyle's friends and Carlyle himself—is touching and interesting. Even these humble details, which take one into the kitchen and the sick-chamber, assume a poetical expression from his pen. Without such a guardian and companion Carlyle might have been driven to despair and suicide by sheer incapacity to face the daily cares of life; and it is not surprising that the loss of such a wife smote him with intolerable affliction and cast a deeper gloom over his declining years.

Upon the whole we have read these volumes with an interest tempered by regret, and we believe this feeling is shared by many of Mr. Carlyle's oldest friends. It is the autopsy of his mind and heart, published, by his desire, almost as soon as the earth had covered his remains. The world is curious of such details, and the personality of Mr. Carlyle was so remarkable, that everything relating to him will be read by large numbers of admirers. They will sympathise with him and applaud his quaint and graphic turns of expression, even in defiance of their better judgment. Those who were wont to hear him converse attest that his conversation was even more whimsical and impressive than his writings. It is probable that his correspondence, which will doubtless be given to the public, for he was a great and excellent writer of letters, will prove one of the best of his literary legacies. But neither his conversation nor his letters can obliterate the painful impression that his was a troubled mind; that he saw all things through the medium of his own dark vision, and not as they are; that he was utterly destitute of self-control and guidance, and expressed himself with a degree of violence bordering on ferocity in speaking or writing of the outer world, of the order and progress of society, and even of those who had befriended him. In fact, his own language does him some injustice, for he was a man of kindlier feelings and wider sympathies than he would allow the world to believe, and he might have risen to a higher and nobler standard if he could have shaken off the incurable habit of referring all things to *himself*. If we might suggest the qualities most essential to a great Teacher of men, they would be consideration for others; a respectful gratitude for benefits conferred upon himself; toleration for all shades of opinion and a mild judgment of conduct at variance with his own; a genuine love of liberty regulated by law: a fervent trust in the progress of mankind throughout the varied scenes of this world's history, directed by Providence to higher ends than we can now discern; and unshaken faith in

the eternal truths of God and immortality, which are the basis of all morality, of all society, of all existence. But of these principles of life, of conduct, and of belief, we find but few traces in the later writings of Mr. Carlyle or in these posthumous volumes.

ART. VIII.—1. *The Power of Movement in Plants.* By CHARLES DARWIN, LL.D., F.R.S.; assisted by FRANCIS DARWIN. London: 1880.

2. *A Text-Book of Physiology.* By M. FOSTER, M.A., M.D., F.R.S., Prælector in Physiology and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Third Edition, revised. London: 1879.

THE movement of plants has long been the object of close observation and ingenious experiment by physiologists. Very nearly a century ago it was perfectly understood that gravity, light, and contact with solid surfaces exerted a powerful influence upon the movements of growth. In 1806 Thomas Andrew Knight, the remarkable man who worthily succeeded Sir Joseph Banks as President of the Horticultural Society, and who was himself a great horticulturist, caused roots to grow horizontally outwards, instead of vertically downwards, by inducing seeds to germinate on the rim of a rapidly rotating disc, thus practically superseding the downward attraction of the earth by the outward impulse of the centrifugal whirl. Hugo von Mohl, of Tübingen, experimentally demonstrated the directive influence of light by leading the stems of young cruciferous plants to reverse the natural tendencies of their growth, and to advance downwards instead of upwards, by enclosing them in a darkened box, into which a gleam of light was reflected through a hole in the bottom by means of a mirror. The response of the leaves of the sensitive plant to the irritation of a rude touch was well known to the earliest botanists. The distinguished French physician Dutrochet, who wrote on the cause of the ascent of stems and the descent of roots in 1828, was aware that the movement of the sensitive plant was due to the transmission of the impulse from the spot where it was received to the soft cushions of cellular tissue at the base of the footstalks of the leaflets and leaves, and even ascertained that the transmission of the excitement from the point of contact was a slow-paced process, requiring something like three seconds for a journey of one inch. The

Frenchman Desfontaines carried sensitive plants about with him in his carriage to prove that they could be educated to become indifferent to jolting. Another observer about the same time ascertained that tendrils cannot untwine after they have once fixed their grip, because the curving movement by which they effect their hold is transmitted upwards along the curling stalk from the spot where the contact is first established. Dutrochet, indeed, in his last work, 'The Anatomical and Physiological History of Plants and Animals,' seems to have settled, as three great canons of vegetable movement, the following propositions:—That the curved position assumed by the roots and stems of plants is not altogether a consequence of growth; that the movement originates in soft, unhardened vesicles; and that the curvature is due to the expansion or swelling of the convex side of the bend, and not to the contraction of the concave part of the curvature.

Hugo von Mohl, in his excellent and well-known monograph on the vegetable cell, introduced to the English reader by Professor Henfrey's translation in 1852, remarked in one passage of the treatise that it was not at that time possible to do more than hazard empty guesses as to the external influences upon which the movements of plants depend, because no satisfactory enquiry had yet been made regarding the fact. This reproach does not, at any rate, lie at the doors of the physiologists of the present day. Several experimental observers have in recent years been directing their attention to the investigation, the last amongst them being Charles Darwin, certainly approached by none of the rest in the indefatigable and persevering way in which he has followed up the problem. That this is the case is amply proved by the distinguished enquirer's book on 'The Power of Movement in Plants,' which has been recently published. The volume, like most of Dr. Darwin's late works, is an elaborate and detailed account of a long series of close observations and experiments. In this case, indeed, the observations have been made by the agency of an ingenious, although simple, apparatus, devised for the purpose, and very skilfully handled.

The value of this elaborate record of close observations will, however, be more justly estimated by those who have already some scientific familiarity with the matters described, than by the much larger number of the reading public who will be attracted to the book by the potent spell of its author's name and renown. It is a tedious task for those who read for the mere purposes of general information to have to wade through

page after page describing eccentric orbits, and grotesque twitchings performed by the spongioles of roots and the growing points of leaves; and the task will scarcely be lightened to readers of this class when they find themselves required to note that some of the movements described are epinastic, whilst others are apogeotropic, and yet others heliotropic; and still further to observe that it is sometimes a hypocotyl, and sometimes an epicotyl, which is subject to these disturbances. To many the tediousness will not be compensated for if they get far enough to discover that these terrible-looking words, after all, only mean that it is an upper or a lower surface that grows the faster; that the movement is away from the ground, or towards the light; or that it is the part of the stem below or above the seed-leaves which extends its length. The technical words of science no doubt have their value for scientific men, but they are not attractive, or helpful to readers of more general education and intelligence. Dr. Darwin must nevertheless have had this more numerous class in his mind when, in the introduction of his book, he suggested the somewhat odd expedient of commencing its perusal at the end, or, in other words, of reading the last chapter first.

The apparatus which Dr. Darwin has employed in the prosecution of his observations on the movements of plants consists of some small rods of glass, a few window panes, cards, sealing-wax, black paint, and shellac dissolved into a thick cement with spirits of wine. The rods, which are very diminutive and light, mere short bristles of glass, are tipped at one end with small bulbs or beads of black sealing-wax to render them conspicuous to the eye, and are fixed by cement, at the other end, to the parts of the plant whose movements are to be observed. A card with a central black dot upon it is next fixed behind the moving part, and one of the window panes is placed as a transparent screen, seven inches away from the plant, either vertically in front or horizontally above, as the case may be. The observer's eye is, after this, moved to and fro outside the screen until the bead upon the glass rod just coincides with, or hides, the black dot upon the card. A corresponding black spot is then dotted in with a pointed style upon the glass sheet or screen, so that it covers or hides both the bead on the rod and the black spot on the card beyond. The black spot on the card, the bead on the rod, and the black spot on the glass are thus manifestly in one continuous straight line. After a suitable interval of time the observation is repeated, and if there has been movement on the part of the

plant a new spot of pigment is dotted in on the glass. The new spot on the glass then obviously indicates the movement which has been accomplished by the black bead, but upon a considerably enlarged scale, because the distance which intervenes between the glass pane and the plant is greater than that between the plant and the card. The line connecting the bead with the screen plays the part of the long arm of a lever pivoted upon the bead, with the point of the short arm kept touching the spot on the card. The movement of the bead is thus magnified to the observer's eye by this expedient as the outline of a drawing is enlarged in the sketch made by the intervention of a pentagraph. The several spots registered upon the glass screen are afterwards connected together upon it by a black line, and the sinuous and complicated figure in this way constructed is copied upon tracing-paper, and kept as a kind of permanent chart of the movement detected by the experiment. There is, however, still the somewhat perplexing consideration to be dealt with, that the chart only represents the movement upon two planes, a vertical and a horizontal one, whereas it in reality takes place in all directions through a space of three dimensions. The tracing on the chart, therefore, has to be interpreted by the observer after it has been laid down, and the actual motion of the glass bead inferred from a close study of the jagged and irregular track. Very many of the figures are of exceeding complexity, being of the nature of scrolls, intersecting each other somewhat after the fashion of the curves traced by the geometric chuck, but aberrant and unsymmetrical instead of being recurrent and regular. Many of them look very much like a track left upon the ground by an ant that has lost its way and is endeavouring to recover its bearings. They therefore require prolonged and patient study before their real meaning can be made out, and the task of interpretation is not more attractive to the general run of readers when it is discovered how large a part is played in the book by these perplexing charts. There are not less than 162 of them contained upon its pages.

The conclusions which Dr. Darwin has himself drawn from these puzzles are, however, as interesting as they are important. In the first place he demonstrates from them that all the growing parts of plants, whether connected with root, stem, or leaves, are unceasingly nodding round—that is, they extend themselves, in the main, along a spiral line of advance; but they nod to and fro as they do so, sometimes

forward and backward, and sometimes from side to side. They advance, so to speak, with a fitful and uncertain, and not with a steady, pace, now jerking upwards with a sudden start, and now jerking backwards with a sort of rebound, so that the actual track through space of any given point of the structure is an irregular ellipse, broken by zigzags and minor curves, and continually changing both its form and plane. It is this fitful movement that Dr. Darwin has designated by the happiest of his new coinage of terms. He calls it by the quite intelligible epithet 'circumnutation.'

The nodding movement of growing plants is next traced to the vesicles of the structure being at alternate intervals more turgid with water and more freely extensile at opposite sides of the growing mass. The alternation of the movement, or swaying from side to side, is ascribed to the vesicles requiring intervals of recruiting and rest after each spasm of exertion. The forward jerk in many instances was not more than a thousandth part of an inch, and the rebound a much slower movement of still smaller extent; and then, after a few seconds of repose, a fresh forward jerk was made, which more than covered the preceding retreat. The backward movement appeared to be mainly, if not entirely, due to the resilient elasticity of the resisting tissue, which reacted up to a limited extent after it had been put upon the stretch by the previous jerk. The forward movement Dr. Darwin himself likens to a 'microscopically minute earthquake in the textures of the plant,' brought about in consequence of the vesicles becoming more and more turgid on one side, until the weakest part suddenly yields and bends to the strain. The circumnuting movement is manifestly controlled and modified by the influence of light, of the alternation of darkness with light, and of gravity, all of which combine to fix the precise lines of the progress.

When a young radicle breaks through the outer coat of a germinating seed, it immediately begins to circumnutate, but soon bends downwards in its spiral course on account of the action of gravity upon its extremity or tip. Dr. Darwin's experiments, however, appear to show that the attraction of gravitation is restricted to the actual tip, but that the impulse or impact is then transmitted to a higher part of the rootlet, where it brings about a one-sided turgescence, and so causes the rootlet to bend. As soon as the tip touches the surface of the soil, it begins to penetrate the outer layer, making its way in by the rocking movement of its point. If it happens in the first

instance to strike a hard and impenetrable portion of the soil, the recumbent seed is tilted up by the resolute thrust of the root. The penetration of the point is moreover assisted in a very wonderful and curious way. A series of fine hairs, destined in the end to act as imbibing tubes for the liquid nourishment, come down from the side of the rootlet, attach themselves to rigid particles in the ground, and hold doggedly on whilst the screwing point is being thrust into the crevices of the soil. The action is then analogous to the one which is used in screwing a corkscrew into the cork of a bottle whilst its neck is grasped by one hand. The attachment of the hairs, to establish this purchase, is accomplished first by the liquefaction of the cell-membrane where it comes into contact with the ground, and then by the setting of the liquefied matter into a kind of tenacious cement. After the tip of the rootlet has made good its entrance into the ground, the force exerted by the circumnutating growth behind drives it onwards. The thrust thus generated is in some instances so great, that the radicles of comparatively small seeds have been observed to displace stones weighing many pounds. The screwing proclivities of the tip materially help it in such cases to find a lateral way of escape whenever the progress is arrested in front. The sensitiveness of the advancing tip to the solicitations of gravity appears to be surprisingly great. In one instance Dr. Darwin found that a rootlet was dragged down into its proper descending course, and very materially bent or bowed, by a beadlet of shellac that weighed less than the two-hundredth part of a grain. When the side of a rootlet presses against a hard ridge or edge, the tip is invariably bent down beyond the position of the hard contact. Moisture also exerts a considerable influence upon the course taken by a rootlet. The tip of a rootlet will even bend in antagonism to the pull of gravity when the solicitation of moisture acts in another direction. Light influences the root in exactly the opposite way. The rootlet is stimulated to circumnutate away from any gleam of light that accidentally falls upon it.

The experiments by which the fact was established, that the bending of growing points is accomplished by an influence transmitted to some distance in the vegetable organisation, are very ingenious and beautiful. The tips of actively growing roots were stripped off, or destroyed by caustic, after they had been exposed to some directive influence, such as gravity, and it was found that the influence was still operative. The tips of the radicles of a bean, having been exposed to the action of

gravity for an hour and a half, were cut off, and the radicles set so that they were directed immediately downwards; but they then moved off transversely to one side, in obedience to the influence that had been lodged in the tissues of their upper part before the tips were removed. After two or three days of horizontal growth, however, new tips were formed at the extremities, and the downward growth was thenceforth resumed.

When the growing stem of a germinating seedling has arched itself up out of the ground, it straightens itself by the quickened growth of the concavity of the arch, and so lifts its seed-leaves into the air. These then assume their proper function of aerial leaves, decomposing carbonic acid and elaborating fresh nourishment for the plant. The upper part of the stem forthwith begins to circumnutate vigorously through the air. New leaves and branches next appear, and every shoot, footstalk, and leaflet, obedient to the primary impulse of vegetable existence, forthwith starts nodding in a little spiral ellipse of its own. But a new and very potent agent, which was not known to the rootlet, is now brought into play. The circumnutating parts are all deluged with light, and almost everywhere that light falls with greater intensity upon one side of the leaf or stem than on the other. This determines a bending towards the light. The growth or extension of tissue takes place most rapidly where the light falls with least force. On the most strongly illuminated side the fixation of carbon and consequent hardening of tissue take the place of growth. The distribution and movement of the leaves are in the same way influenced by circumnutation, controlled and directed by the luminous influence.

The so-called sleep of leaves is merely a modified form of these combined operations. It consists, in the main, of the flat leaves of plants assuming, towards evening or night, a vertical position upon their footstalks, or of the leaflets of compound leaves folding themselves vertically together into a similar (although inverted) position to the one assumed by the wings of the butterfly when the insect is at rest upon a flower. All the leaves which perform this movement have cushions of soft cellular texture, known as pulvinuli, upon the footstalk just beneath the blade. It has been long known that these soft expansions of the footstalks are the efficient instruments of the mechanism. The action is periodical, and dependent upon the alternations of darkness and light. The designation 'sleep of plants' was in the first instance given to

this movement because it was conceived to be really a kind of lassitude or exhaustion resulting from the long-continued strain of diurnal illumination.

Dr. Darwin has now shown that this night-bending movement of leaves is itself only one form of circumnutation. It is a large orbital movement in a vertical direction, having a period of twenty-four hours, and brought about by the unequal action of light on opposite sides of the pulvinuli, or cushion-like enlargements of the footstalks. The turgescence and growth are so modified on opposite sides by difference of illumination, that the leaf is bent upon the soft, easily yielding swelling of the footstalk, as upon a joint. A very ingenious experiment was devised to prove that it is the difference of light, rather than its absolute influence, which is the cause of the bending. One pot of the seedlings of a cassia was kept in a dark part of a room, and its seed-leaves remained closed; another similar pot was placed in the sunshine near the window, and its seed-leaves unfolded. Both pots were then removed into the subdued or half light of the middle of the room, and the folded leaves then opened, because they had been brought into a stronger light, but the unfolded seed-leaves at the same time closed, because the change with them had been from sunshine to shade. Seedlings were artificially bent towards the light by illuminating them on one side for two or three minutes at a time by a small wax taper, and by repeating this, with intervals of darkness between, for about three-quarters of an hour. It was found that more bending could be produced in twenty minutes by this process of alternation of darkness and light than by steady exposure to strong light for an hour. These experiments are as conclusive as they are interesting.

The explanation of the purpose of these curious movements of plants, at which Dr. Darwin has arrived, is to the effect that they are all a provision for protecting the leaves from the injurious effect of a too rapid radiation of heat at night. The blade of the leaflet that is opposed horizontally to a cloudless sky at night is very much more severely chilled than one which is for the time hung with its narrow edge towards the sky, or in which the radiating surfaces are folded into close contact. Dr. Darwin found by direct experiment that dew is deposited at night upon horizontally expanded leaves, when no trace of it appears upon folded or vertical ones. In various experiments, leaflets which were pinned open died from frost, whilst others near, which were left free to fold themselves up, suffered no injury. Dr. Darwin also proved by his experi-

mental apparatus that the night-bending movement is in some measure continuous through the entire twenty-four hours. There is no period of absolute rest. It is merely that the general diurnal circumnutating progress is quickened at one time, and retarded at another.

Dr. Darwin does not pretend to know anything whatever as to the way in which light, gravitation, pressure, contact, and innate physical states act upon the vesicles to produce these capricious and fitful modifications of growth. All that he contends for is that those influences are not themselves the primary cause of the movements, but merely lead to a temporary increase or diminution of the spontaneous changes of turgescence already in progress in the vessels, and which are themselves indicated by the circumnutation of leaves, stems, and rootlets. He believes that the clasping of tendrils and the folding of the leaflets of the sensitive plant when touched are less immediately connected with the fundamental movement of circumnutation. But he thinks that the difference is still more one of degree than of kind, and that in all such cases the irritant merely starts a change of turgescence similar to the one which ordinarily occurs in the circumnutation of growth.

The tips of the rootlets of plants are obviously parts of the very highest vital importance. They are endowed with a keen faculty of discrimination, and, in a certain sense, of perception. Dr. Darwin, indeed, seems inclined to regard them as possessing almost the attributes of a vegetable brain, as appears from the following noteworthy passage:—

‘We believe that there is no structure in plants more wonderful, as far as its functions are concerned, than the tip of the radicle. If the tip be lightly pressed, or burnt, or cut, it transmits an influence to the upper adjoining part, causing it to bend away from the affected side; and, what is more surprising, the tip can distinguish between a slightly harder and softer object, by which it is simultaneously pressed on opposite sides. If, however, the radicle is pressed by a similar object a little above the tip, the pressed part does not transmit any influence to the more distant parts, but bends abruptly towards the object. If the tip perceives the air to be moister on one side than on the other, it likewise transmits an influence to the upper adjoining part, which bends towards the source of moisture. When the tip is excited by light (though in the case of the radicles this was ascertained in only a single instance), the adjoining part bends from the light; but when excited by gravitation the same part bends towards the centre of gravity. In almost every case we can clearly perceive the final purpose or advantage of the several movements. Two, or perhaps more, of the exciting causes often act simultaneously on the tip, and one

conquers the other, no doubt in accordance with its importance for the life of the plant. The course pursued by the radicle in penetrating the ground must be determined by the tip; hence it has acquired such diverse kinds of sensitiveness. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the tip of the radicle thus endowed, and having the power of directing the movements of the adjoining parts, acts like the brain of one of the lower animals; the brain being seated within the anterior end of the body, receiving impressions from the sense-organs, and directing the several movements.'

In some passages of his book Dr. Darwin seems inclined to regard the power of movement in plants as analogous to the motor power of animals. This is a doctrine which has been accepted with favour in recent years by a considerable school of comparative physiologists, and it is one which has become especially dear to the hearts of evolutionists. The general tenor of the observations here so elaborately described can hardly, however, be received as tending to strengthen this view. Dr. Darwin traces all movement in plants back to circumnutation. But animals do not circumnutate. Their movements are of a strikingly different character from the nodding and staggering gyration which is here pointed to as the primary process in the plant. The stems, roots, and leaves are thrust out in consequence of the interstitial deposit of new material in the growing textures, and the extending shoots assume a spiral form of advance because the thrust is exerted more on one side than on the other. The onward projection is thus essentially a process of growth from the addition of substance, and all the irregularities in the halting progress are immediately ascribed to a purely physical cause, the swelling or increased turgidity of the tissue at the point where the sidelong thrust occurs. The only circumstance that at all warrants the assumption of a resemblance in the strongly contrasted processes is the fact, which Dr. Darwin has brought prominently into notice, that the mechanical impulse of the disturbing influence originates not at the spot upon which the impact falls, but at a somewhat distant place, to which the effect of that impact is transmitted by an intermediate agency seated in the organisation of the plant. He is obviously aware that this is the strong point of the argument for resemblance which he suggests, as in one notable paragraph he says: 'But the most striking resemblance is the localisation of sensitiveness, and the transmission of an influence from the excited part to another, which consequently moves.' The effect here alluded to is, no doubt, very remarkable, and well deserving of the further examination which it will assuredly receive at the hands of physiologists. But it can hardly be conceived to

be strong enough to support any comprehensive hypothesis of the identity of vegetable and animal movements. Dr. Darwin himself says, 'Plants do not, of course, possess nerves or a 'central nervous system.' But he then deprecatingly and somewhat significantly adds, 'and we may infer that with 'animals such structures serve only for the more perfect transmission of impressions, and for the more complete intercommunication of the several parts.'

The dissimilarity between the circumnutating movements of plants and animal movement is obvious at a glance when one of the simplest instances of animal movement is taken for the purpose of comparison. It at once reveals that spontaneity and so-called voluntary character of the animal movement, which the older physiologists had no difficulty in recognising as its distinctive mark. In his monograph on the vegetable cell Von Mohl very clearly expresses the view which was at that time held by the best authorities in the following passage:—

'Great as the similarity to animal motion is in many of these plant-movements, they are always devoid of the character of volition, so that altogether no more definite and profound distinction between plants and animals can be found than the total want of voluntary motion in the former, and the presence of this same in the latter.'

The simplest form in which animal movement can be observed is that which is presented by the protoplasmic, or 'first-mould,' substance of animal organisation. As soon as the complex organisable material, provided by the successive processes of constructive elaboration, has received the final impress of life from the touch of some already living structure, it forthwith begins to move by the exercise of a newly acquired property. The movement manifested is indeed so constant in its association with life that its occurrence is familiarly looked upon as a proof of the presence of vitality. But the movement thus developed is of a very remarkable kind. The living protoplasm streams or surges about within itself, and the internal and intrinsic surging is maintained without appreciable cessation. The molecules of the mass hold together with just adhesiveness enough to prevent them from falling asunder; but they slide to and fro over each other in all directions in the most free and unconstrained way, as gelatinised water might be conceived to do. Any small isolated fragment of this animated jelly is thus always changing its form. There is, indeed, a minute creature of the group of animalcules, well known to microscopic observers, that is entirely composed of this undifferentiated protoplasm—that is, of protoplasm in

which every part is exactly like the rest, and in which there is no distinction or differentiation into special organs, such as muscle, nerve, and bone. It is known as the *amœba*,* or 'changeling,' on account of the Proteus-like transformations of its shape—a most expressive name, which was conferred upon it by Christian Godfrey Ehrenberg, one of the fathers of microscopic observation, and author of the great work on 'Infusorial Animalcules,' published in Germany in 1838. The creature is found most commonly in the slime which collects upon submerged or floating objects. It is apparently destitute even of a skin, and it has no internal organ of any kind. It is simply a small mass of animated jelly, possessing the power of streaming half coherently about under some mysterious and apparently spontaneously exerted impulse. When first placed upon the glass slide of a microscope, it presents the aspect of a small, round, transparent mass; but finger-like processes soon begin to be pushed out from the pulp in various directions, somewhat after the manner of the horns of a snail. Some one of these having at last fixed itself to the glass, the rest of the mobile jelly rolls over the attached part, and then begins to push out other processes. The *amœba*, in reality, travels along the glass in this grotesque shambling way. By the mere flow of its half-coherent living substance, it not only changes its form, but shifts its position. If, during its Protean shambling progress, it comes in contact with any fragmentary morsel suitable to be turned to account as food, it spreads itself over the fragment until it envelopes it within its own substance, and in that way extemporises a digestive cavity or stomach, where the morsel soon gets dissolved and converted into living protoplasm. Indigestible matters, which cannot be so turned to account, are dismissed by a reversal of the process; the fluent jelly loosening its grasp, rolling itself off, and so leaving them behind as it moves away in some other direction.

* From *amoibos*, exchanging or transforming. Although the name *amœba* was contrived for this animalcule by Ehrenberg, the creature itself was previously known as the *Proteus diffluens*, under which designation it appeared, in 1786, in Müller's 'Animalcula Infusoria.' Its real nature was, however, so little understood by the earlier observers, that it was at first spoken of as possessing many stomachs, and was classed with the forms then distinguished as Polygastrica. One keen observer, after Ehrenberg's change of its name, alluded to the clear way in which its *internal organisation* could be seen. This curious mistake was, however, obviously due to the almost constant presence of foreign bodies enveloped in its soft fluent mass.

This microscopic changeling of Ehrenberg is an object of the very deepest interest to physiologists, because it is a typical specimen of the raw material of animal life presented to observation in its simplest and least disguised form. Although a mere lump of animated jelly without any trace of specialised organisation, it yet manages to perform several of the most important operations of animal life, accomplishing, in its organless state, results which, in the more highly endowed animals, are performed only through the instrumentality of an elaborately complex and diversified apparatus. It extemporises, in the rudest, but nevertheless most effective way, actions which are essential to its lowly form of existence. Its fluent pulp serves it in the place of limbs. It turns its own flesh into a stomach, and secretes a digesting juice round its entangled prey. It assimilates and appropriates food, and turns it into mobile living substance like itself. It consumes its own pulp by the wasting efforts of its movements. It reproduces living lumps like itself by breaking up into fragments, and above all *it breathes*, not through the specialised appendage of lungs, but throughout its entire gelatinous mass. The air permeates its naked or skinless pulp, and oxygen is appropriated and carbonic acid generated and expelled. It is oxidised, or burned, so to speak, and its powers of shambling movement, of digesting food, of elaborating secretions, and of performing other allied operations, are as essentially a result of that combustive oxidation as the flame of a candle is the result of the burning of its stearine or wax. This process of oxidation, or faculty of breathing, indeed, constitutes its claim to the distinction of being 'animated.' The word simply implies that it possesses *anima*, or breath. This, then, is radically the difference to which it is our purpose to draw attention. Plants move because they grow. The circumnutation, which Dr. Darwin discovers at the bottom of the movements of the plant, is an effect of growth. It is due to elaboration and building up. Wherever it is manifesting itself, carbon is in process of being fixed, and oxygen in the process of emancipation and discharge. But the animal protoplasm—the basement of animated flesh—moves because it is in process of combustive destruction, which is the exact opposite of elaborating construction. Heat is appropriated in the case of the vegetable movement, and rendered latent as one of the constituents of the accumulating structure, and as an implement of cohesion. The sunshine is actually put to the work of holding together the constituent elements of the molecules of the enlarging mass. Heat is set free, in the case of the animal movement, as a

supply of energy or power capable of doing work, and in the breathing animal, as a result of the dissolution and destruction of the cohesive integrity of previously built-up molecules.

But the amœba of the microscope, it is here to be understood, is hardly to be looked upon as an exceptional case of vital organisation, although it is familiarly spoken of as a little animal, or animalcule. It is rather a fragment of the universal material, of which animal bodies are made, accidentally caught when engaged upon a roving commission. The bodies of all animals, even of the highest type of organisation, not excepting that of man himself, are now regarded by physiologists as groups of amœbas associated together for the advantage the well-organised division of labour confers. Each body is a colony of these living plastic lumps. But, as the separate amœbic individuals are arranged in the group, clusters are told off for different services, and are then specially equipped for the task which is committed to their charge. Some are made into vesicles adapted for the construction of cartilage; some are converted into bone; some are moulded into the contractile fibres of muscular flesh, and some into the more highly finished and specially endowed vesicles and tubules of nerve-structure and brain. But all such diversities of structure, provided for the working out of the end of specialised vitality, begin as clusterings of fluent protoplasm, in all respects identical with the specimen to which Ehrenberg drew attention in its erratic isolation. In the flowing stream of the blood, the colourless granules, which are microscopically seen floating along in the current, and which have been termed white corpuscles, are neither more nor less than lumps of freshly formed living protoplasm, in process of distribution to the different parts where the foundations of new structure are being laid. They, each and all, possess the same power of fluent mobility and restless change of form, which is more conveniently observed in the amœba animalcule. They individually present all the grotesque portraiture of that Protean changeling. But, when they reach their ultimate destinations, the differentiation, or adaptation of each to the work to which it is destined, is accomplished simply by the exaltation of some one or other of its inherent proclivities, and by the lowering or subordination of the rest. In the muscular tissue, fluent mobility is the property most prominently brought into play; in the nervous tissues, it is the irritability, or readiness of response to extraneous impact, which is thrown into relief; in the construction of such organs as the liver, the stomach, and the kidneys, the chemical power of effecting molecular transfor-

mation is most prominently developed; and in bone, the masses of protoplasm are densely infiltrated and packed with hard lime for the construction of the mechanical framework of the body—its strong pillars and rigid walls. In his admirably executed and classical ‘Text-Book of Physiology’—which for its excellences, whether of condensation or completeness, is everywhere deserving of the most unqualified praise—Professor Foster puts this view of the case very happily in the following paragraph, which is perhaps as telling an illustration of the distinction it is our object to establish as it is possible to desire. He says:—

‘We may therefore consider the complex body of a higher animal as a compound of so many tissues, each tissue corresponding to one of the fundamental qualities of protoplasm, to the development of which it is specially devoted by the division of labour. It must, however, be remembered that there is a distinct limit to the division of labour. In each and every tissue, in addition to its leading quality, there are more or less pronounced remnants of all the other protoplasmic qualities. Thus, though we may call one tissue *par excellence* metabolic,* all the tissues are to a greater or less extent metabolic. The energy of each, whatever be its particular mode, has its source in the breaking up of the protoplasm. Chemical changes, including the assumption of oxygen, and the production, complete or partial, of carbonic acid, and therefore also entailing a certain amount of secretion and excretion, must take place in each and every tissue. And so with all the other fundamental properties of protoplasm. Even contractility, which for obvious mechanical reasons is soonest reduced where not wanted, is present in many other tissues besides muscle. And it need hardly be said that each tissue retains the power of assimilation. However thoroughly the material of food be prepared by digestion and subsequent metabolic action, the last stages of its conversion into living protoplasm are effected directly and alone by the tissue of which it is about to form a part.’

But, as soon as this transmutation of the protoplasm into special organs has been accomplished, it becomes indispensable to the harmonious co-operation of the several parts that inter-communication between them shall be arranged. There must be channels laid down for transmission of impressions, for exchange of signals, from place to place, and for the connexion of the whole into a co-ordinated system. It is this purpose, as the author of the Text-Book proceeds to show, which is accomplished by the circulation of the blood and by the agency of the nerves. The blood circulation is the bond by which the new protoplasmic material is distributed to all vitally act-

* Transmutable.

ing and vitally moving parts, and by which they are cleared from the waste products of the animated or breathing consumption. The nerves are the bonds by which the remote oases of protoplasm, separated by intervening tracts of less vitalised material, are connected, so that the impulses experienced in one part may be transmitted for setting up associated and correlated discharges of work-performing energy in other parts of the systematised organisation.

In the more highly endowed animals it is the gradual conversion of the living protoplasm into special organs which confers upon the body its particular external character and shape, comprising the central and crowning skull for the safe lodgment of the nerve-core with its outlying apparatus of organs of sense, the internal cavities for the accommodation of stomach, liver, and lungs, and the external appendage of mobile and flexible limbs. But, as the power of movement is, in the animal, one of the most important endowments for the great purposes of life, motor mechanisms of the most refined ingenuity and the most perfect construction are distributed to all parts of the frame, in every one of which the prime mover is muscular contraction. It is in reference to this that Professor Foster very aptly remarks: 'In fact, the greater part of the animal body is a collection of muscular machines, some serving for locomotion, others for special manœuvres of particular members and parts, others as an assistance to the senses, and yet others for the production of voice, and, in man, of speech.'

But in all these the physical conditions of muscular action are precisely those which have been alluded to as conferring moving power upon the amœba and unformed protoplasm. 'The amœboid movements,' as Professor Foster truly says, 'are identical in their fundamental nature with those which, occurring in a muscle, cause contraction. A muscular contraction is essentially a regular, an amœboid movement, an irregular flow of protoplasm.' In both there is the same consumption of substance under the oxidising blast, and the same production of moving energy out of molecular destruction. The movement, therefore, is obviously in absolute contrast with the one which is observed in plants, and remarkably sustains the view of the older physiologists, rather than the tendencies of the newer school to regard animal movement as an evolution of the process in plants, which Dr. Darwin has in these late observations so thoroughly identified with mere irregularities of growth. Von Mohl's philosophic deduction, that the want of voluntary motion in plants, and its constant

presence in animals, is a profound distinction, is certainly in no sense weakened by Dr. Darwin's demonstration that all movement in plants is modified circumnutation, and that circumnutation is the combined result of turgescence and growth.

We are quite aware that the assertion of the resemblance, which we here contest, has been made in somewhat cautious language. Thus, in the one passage in which the analogy is perhaps the most pointedly affirmed, the author's own words are to the following effect: 'It is impossible not to be struck with the resemblance between the foregoing movements of plants and many of the actions performed unconsciously by the lower animals.' But our own comment upon this is that the *amœba*, which we have taken as the typical illustration of the power of animal movement, is itself the lowest of low animals, at the same time that it is in its entire organisation identical with the most universally diffused of animated structures. It is at once the protozoon, as well as the protoplasm, of the animal kingdom. It plays, in our argument, identically the same part that the circumnutating root and stem-tissue assume in Dr. Darwin's exposition. As he finds structure-consolidating growth in every diversity of plant-movement, we find protoplasmic oxidation and combustion underlying each movement of the animal.

There are, however, other forms of movement which are shared by both animals and plants, as, for instance, and supereminently, the well-known ciliary movement. Exigency of space prevents these from being further alluded to upon this occasion. We must, however, just state that nothing of the character of a satisfactory hypothesis can yet be based upon these movements, because their intrinsic nature is still absolutely unknown. All efforts to detect the mechanism by which they are brought about have hitherto signally failed. But the effect is certainly a feature common to the two contrasted kingdoms of living existence, rather than a border attribute by which one slides into the other. It is something at once distinct from either the growth-movement of Dr. Darwin, or the animal movement evolved from oxidation. Each little cilium, or lash, bends upon itself into the form of a sickle, or after the fashion of a carter's whip, and strikes with some considerable force in the direction in which it bends, and then straightens itself back in a more gentle way, so that the principal part of its flapping stroke is expended in the direction of the quicker movement. When the cilia are attached to a fixed solid surface, immersed in water or other liquid, the lashing movement produces a wave-like disturbance in the

liquid. But when they are attached to light vesicles floating freely in water, they serve as oars or propelling paddles, and drive the vesicles along. It is in this latter form that they are met with in plant structures. The spores, or imperfect seeds, of many of the most lowly water plants are enabled to swarm to new growing grounds by their instrumentality. But they are even more abundantly encountered in the bodies of the higher animals, being in them closely set upon the free surface of mucous membranes, which lead to the outer air, and in connexion with these they perform the good service of keeping the liquid secretions moving towards the outlet of escape. They do this in the air-tubes of the lungs and in the windpipe. Whilst engaged in this work their movement is quite unceasing, and the lashing is manifestly an involuntary operation. It is continued, indeed, long after the death of the organic membranes to which the lashing cilia are attached, and long after all arrest of the flow of blood. If the windpipe of an ox is slit open shortly after the death of the animal and a small piece of its lining membrane is cut off and placed flat upon the table, weights of as much as 100 grains deposited upon its surface may be seen to be shunted along in the direction of the ciliary impulse. Powdered charcoal dusted over the membrane is gradually cleared away by being brushed off at one end. In some remarkable instances this lashing movement of the ciliary processes of mucous membrane has been found to continue as long as three weeks after the death of the animal from which the scrap of membrane has been taken. It is therefore obvious that this kind of activity is something, at any rate, of a much lower grade than the spontaneous and voluntary manifestation of work-producing force, which, for the purposes of this article, has been spoken of as the movement proper of animal life.

ART. IX.—*Ilios: the City and Country of the Trojans*. The Results of Researches and Discoveries on the Site of Troy and throughout the Troad in the years 1871–73, 78–79. By Dr. HENRY SCHLIEMANN. London: 1880.

IT is now about a hundred years since the site of Homeric Troy became a question for modern travellers and scholars. Three places in the Troad have, since then, been the chief competitors for the honour. Le Chevalier, whose visits were made in 1785–86, fixed on Bunarbashi, a village situated at a point where the lower spurs of Ida touch the southern edge

of the Ilian plain, and about nine miles from the Hellespont.* This view has, until recently, had by far the largest share of support. Among those who have adopted or favoured it may be mentioned Ernst Curtius, Forchhammer, and Kiepert, Colonel Leake, and Mr. H. F. Tozer. Another theory favours the site anciently known as 'the Village of 'the Ilians,' and now marked by the Turkish village of Atchi-kôî, at a short distance N.W.N. of Bunarbashi. This opinion was elaborately advocated in the second century B.C. by Demetrius of Scepsis, a learned native of the Troad, who had made the topography of the 'Iliad' his special study. Strabo, the geographer, was one of its adherents; in the present century it has been accepted by Major J. Rennell (1814), and, more recently, by Dr. H. N. Ulrichs. Lastly, the site of the historic Greek Ilium at Hissarlik was in ancient times claimed by a local tradition as the site of the earlier Trojan city. Before the date of Dr. Schliemann's excavations, few scholars had admitted this claim; but among those few were Mr. Grote,—who has given an excellent summary of the controversy so far as it had then been developed,—and Dr. Julius Braun, the author of a work on 'Homer and his Age.' The mound of 'Hissarlik' ('fortress' in Turkish) stands nearly in the middle of the Trojan plain, about five miles north of Bunarbashi, and upwards of three miles from the Hellespont. The average elevation of the plateau is not more than eighty feet above the level of the plain. But the north-western part of the mound rises about twenty-five feet above the rest. It was on this north-western eminence, which measures about 325 yards by 235, that Dr. Schliemann commenced his excavations. Here had been the acropolis of the Greek Ilium; and here he hoped to discover the Pergamus of Homeric Troy. His excavations were carried to a depth of nearly fifty-three feet below the surface. The remains discovered are now referred by him to no fewer than seven successive cities. The city nearest the surface was the historic Greek Ilium. The fifth city below the surface was, he thinks, the Trojan Ilium of Homer.

* Le Chevalier's hypothesis, which had been impugned by Jacob Bryant (1795), was vindicated by J. B. S. Morritt (1798), and by William Gell (1801). Gell's work, 'The Topography of Troy and its Vicinity'—based on a personal examination of the Troad—was reviewed in the sixth volume of this Journal (p. 258) by the Earl of Aberdeen, soon after his return from a visit to the Troad in 1805. Among other objections to the Bunarbashi theory, the writer points out the difficulty of reconciling it with the movements of Agenor in the twenty-first book of the 'Iliad' (vv. 487-571).

The narrative of Dr. Schliemann's excavations in the Troad from October, 1871, to June, 1873, was published in 1874. His researches were resumed in September, 1878, and continued during part of 1879. The work now published is an account of his labours in the Troad from their commencement to their close. The massive volume is copiously illustrated, and shows abundant evidence of the pains bestowed upon its preparation; but it is impossible not to regret that more literary skill was not employed in rendering its contents attractive to readers. The great length of the book is due not merely to a verbose style, but, even more, to the practice of giving at full length quotations (often of pages) from innumerable writers whose views might have been indicated in a few lines. The arrangement, too, is more defective than any that we can remember to have observed in a work of equal claims. Dr. Schliemann has, in fact, been embarrassed by the very multitude of his allies. As the 'Iliad' allows each hero to shine in turn, so the generous pages of 'Ilios' have offered an open field to every aspirant; and unity of plan is a merit which can be more easily vindicated for the epic than for the treatise. The appendices on various subjects and by various hands are not only diverse in scale but very unequal in merit. A real value belongs, in one or another sense, to the contributions of Professors Paul Ascherson, Theodor von Heldreich, Virchow, and Brugsch Bey; of Doctors F. Kurtz and Julius Schmidt; of Messrs. F. Calvert and A. Duffield. Others, again, are less worthy of the subjects with which they profess to deal; thus the short appendix (No. II.) on 'Novum Ilium' is singularly inadequate. Where, however, the contributors have been so miscellaneous, it was to be expected that some of them should be a source of bulk rather than strength; and it would be no grateful task to dwell on such blemishes. We propose now to consider Dr. Schliemann's discoveries in their larger and broader aspects. He has shown, by the unanswerable proof of digging, that the hill of Ilissarlik had been a seat of human habitation from a remote antiquity. Objects neither Hellenic nor Roman, and certainly very ancient, have been found buried deep in the soil. How far will these facts bear the interpretation which he places on them? How far, and in what sense, can they be regarded as illustrating the Homeric poems?

Our conception of the problem which any such excavations could tend to solve will of course depend primarily on the manner in which we regard the whole tale of Troy. Few legends of world-wide fame have experienced more striking

vicissitudes of popular belief. To all Greek and Roman antiquity, if a few critical minds be excepted, the siege of Troy was an event not less historical than the expedition of Xerxes or the Peloponnesian war. Nor is it so very long since English schoolboys were taught to consider 1184 B.C. as a date of the same kind as 480 B.C. or 431 B.C. Then came a period when the personages of myth and of history were decimated by the solar theory. Most persons whose lives had not been wholly sedentary, and who had not already been proved to be the night or the moon, were proved to be the dawn or the sun. (Edipus, guessing the riddle of the Sphinx, wedding and slaying his mother Iocastè, then, in horror, blinding himself, was found to be the sungod banishing the mysterious gloom, winning his way to the embraces of the violet dawn from whose bridal chamber he comes forth only to destroy her, and then himself quenched in the darkness which closes around his declining course. Odysseus, voyaging to western lands, was demonstrated to be a type of the sunset by reasonings which would have applied with equal force to Christopher Columbus. It was to be expected that the tale of Troy should be tested by the same solvent. And accordingly a comparative mythologist was found to affirm that the siege of Troy was merely 'a repetition of the daily siege of the East by the solar powers 'that every evening are robbed of their treasures in the west.'* That is, the abduction of Helen by Paris is a story suggested by the daily phenomenon of sunset. Troy, beleaguered and conquered by the Achæan host, is the region of the dawn beset and possessed by the rising sun. Again, Achilles is in his own person the sun; his 'wrath,' his gloomy and sullen inaction, is the temporary withdrawal of the sun behind the veil of the storm-cloud.† When Achilles maltreats the body of the slain Hector,‡ it is as when 'the blazing sun seems 'to trample on the darkness into which it is sinking.'§ And similarly the loss of the Golden Fleece is once again the sunset; the successful voyage and return of Jason is the renewed brightness of the solar god. Nay, the 'Return of the Hera-cleidaë'—though here the movement happened to be from north to south—becomes nothing more than a symbol of the sun's journey from east to west.||

No competent scholar will now be found to question the

* Professor Max Müller, 'Lectures on the Science of Language,' 2nd Series, 471.

† Cox, 'Mythology of the Aryan Nations,' vol. i. p. 90.

‡ Il. xxii. 395.

§ Cox, i. 252.

|| Ib. 204.

fruitfulness of the comparative method as applied to mythology, or the special importance, within proper limits, of the solar idea. And, in relation to such a story as that of the 'Iliad,' the solar explanation can at least claim to be more scientific than that of the modern Euhemerists. It will be remembered that the method which takes its name from Euhemerus, a Sicilian contemporary of Alexander the Great, consists in subtracting from a legend all that is supernatural, and pronouncing the remainder to be historical. Homer says that Achilles slew Hector with the aid of the goddess Athene. The Euhemerist omits Athene, and affirms as a fact that Achilles slew Hector. The Euhemeristic or 'pragmatising' tendency is doubtless as old as reflection on mythology. It appears sometimes in Herodotus, whose belief in the supernatural is so ready and so reverential. It is seen fully developed in Thucydides, when, in discussing the cause of the Trojan war, he substitutes the political ambition of Agamemnon for the loss of Helen, and suggests that the ten years' duration of the siege may have been owing to the fact that part of the Greek army busied themselves with agriculture and part with piracy. Modern Euhemerists have dealt with the story in like fashion—going, however, even further than Thucydides in eliminating those elements of the legend which seemed to them improbable, while they asserted the historical character of its general outline. Mr. Grote deserves the credit of having first shown that such a procedure is thoroughly unscientific. The statement that a man named Achilles fought at a siege of Troy with a man named Hector rests on precisely the same evidence as the statement that the gods Ares and Apollo mingled in the fray. If we consider that the rape of Helen was an inadequate motive for the war, we are not logically entitled to assume that the war took place, and to invent another motive, strong enough, in our opinion, to explain it.

Since, then, the human plot of the 'Iliad' is inextricably interwoven with threads of miraculous agency, must the whole be relegated to cloudland? That is the conclusion of the comparative mythologists who adopt the solar interpretation. Between their view, however, and that of the Euhemerists an intermediate position is tenable; but it is one which needs to be carefully defined. The evidence of tradition, language, and archaeology proves that, in the prehistoric ages of Greece, Æolic settlements were made in the north-west part of Asia Minor, including the region known as the Troad. These Æolic settlers were in large part Achæans from Greece Proper; and it is certain that they cannot, in all or in most

cases, have established themselves without some hard fighting. It so happens that the beginning of the historical age furnishes us with an excellent and suggestive illustration in miniature of the struggles which probably attended on these early Achaean immigrations. In the course of the seventh century B.C. the Mitylenæans of Lesbos had made settlements in the Troad. About 620 B.C. an Athenian colony occupied Sigeum, on its north-west coast. The Mitylenæans resisted the intrusion of the new-comers, and waged war against them from the neighbouring stronghold of Achilleum. Deeds of personal prowess were done on both sides. Pittacus, the leader of the Mitylenæans—the Hector of this ‘Little Iliad’—slew Phrynon, the Athenian leader, with the aid of a net, much in the manner of a Roman *retiarius*.* Here, then, in the early dawn of Hellenic history and on the very battlefields of the ‘Iliad,’ we have a struggle of invader with possessor, similar in kind, however dissimilar in scale, to that which the ‘Iliad’ describes. And now we may enquire how far analogy can assist us in estimating the historical element which may be expected to reside in the legend of Troy. An ‘historical’ statement is a statement which we accept as true—either absolutely, when the evidence produced for it is conclusive; or preferentially, when the evidence, though not conclusive, is stronger than for any other version of the same facts. ‘Romance,’ in the proper sense, arises when, apart from any intention to deceive, the imagination plays, consciously or unconsciously, with historical facts or persons. A fact is a matter of ‘tradition,’ not ‘history,’ when a statement purporting to be true has been handed down without such contemporary or other evidence as warrants us in concluding its truth. And in those prehistoric ages of which ‘tradition’ is the only record, myth or ‘fable’ plays around tradition, just as romance plays around history. There is, however, this essential difference: the test of history enables us to sift the true from the false in the romantic version of historical events; but tradition supplies no touchstone by which we can surely discern the genuine or spurious ingredients of the myth. Still, within narrow and carefully observed limits, it is permissible to draw inferences from the analogous relations in the two cases.

A parallel has sometimes been drawn between the legend of Agamemnon and that of Charlemagne; but such a procedure cannot evade the objections which proverbially apply to parallelisms in the proper field of history. If, however, we refrain from the attempt to develop a complete parallel, and

* Herod. v. 95; Diog. Laert. i. 74; Polyæn. i. 25; Plut. ii. 858,

direct our attention to certain points of the Carolingian romance, it may perhaps be found instructive, or at least suggestive, in relation to the Ilian myth. Suppose that we were without those contemporary documents which attest the historical fact that a German Emperor once ruled over all Western Europe. The later French romance would have appeared to make a most improbable assertion when it describes the dominions of Charlemagne as extending from the Eider to the Ebro. So, when that Hellenic tradition on which the myth is embroidered speaks of a time when an Achæan Bretwalda was suzerain of insular and Argive Hellas, we may reasonably say that such a tradition is at least confirmed by the analogy of the romance which had a basis of fact. Mycenæ was in historical days a petty place. Thucydides emphasises the contrast between its aspect and its renown. Here is a point which suggests that the Greek myth had been even truer to fact than the French romance. The latter places the capital of Charlemagne at Paris; much as if the Greek myth had installed Agamemnon at Sparta. But the real capital of Charlemagne was at Aachen; had that of Agamemnon been at Sparta, assuredly the myth would not have moved it to Mycenæ. Again, the romance sends Charlemagne on a crusade to Jerusalem. We happen to know that this crusade, indeed, is a fiction, but also that there was a time when participation in a crusade belonged to the ideal of chivalry. When Agamemnon, lord of Argos and the isles, leads forth a great host to fight against Troy in the sacred cause of plighted troth, analogy would lead us to say that we cannot be sure whether this particular war was ever waged or not; but that there is a high probability in favour of some war or wars having been waged there, and having been signalised by deeds of Achæan valour. And there happens to be other evidence which makes this general inference certain. Again, the romance says that Roland was killed in the Pyrenees, fighting against Saracens; history records the bald fact that 'Hruodlandus, Britannici limitis præfectus,' was killed in the Pyrenees fighting against Gascons. Though no array of such instances would much weaken or strengthen the probability that a brave man named Achilles conquered Lesbos, yet we are at least warranted in holding it to be probable that at some time or other Lesbos had been conquered by a Greek leader.

Let us apply these results to the 'Iliad.' All that they warrant us in assuming is that there must once have been hard fighting for the possession of towns in the country where Ilium stood, that Achæan chiefs must have distinguished

themselves in this fighting, and that, among these chiefs, there may have been one in a position similar to that of Agamemnon. As to the details of the story—Helen's flight with Paris, the wrath of Achilles, the death of Hector—these and all other particular incidents may be either myth or fact, in proportions for which we have absolutely no scientific measure, and on which it is idle to speculate. One inference may, however, be drawn from the supernatural element in the tale of Troy—an element on which some of the comparative mythologists seem to have laid an unjustifiable stress. Under the fascinating spell of comparative mythology—when its doctrines are set forth with the eloquence and the ingenuity which some of its exponents command—it is too easy to forget the homely truth that, next to their own concerns, nothing is so interesting to men and women as the doings of their fellow-creatures. The basis of the 'Iliad' is essentially and profoundly human. What the thaumaturgic element really proves is that the events of the 'Iliad' were conceived by the poet as separated from his own age by a large interval of time. The chronicler Hecataeus, in tracing his own pedigree, made out that his sixteenth ancestor had been a god.* That is—taking the *genea* at its average conventional length of thirty years—he considered that a date of some 480 years back was sufficient to give a decent probability to his claim of divine lineage. In the historical age of Greece men could still credit such isolated apparitions at supreme moments as the appearance of Pan to the courier Pheidippides on his way from Athens to Sparta, the presence of the heroes Theseus and Echelus in the fray at Marathon, or the vision of a female form which hovered, with words of reproach and exhortation, over the Greek ships at Salamis.† But such a part as is played by debating or warring gods in the economy of the 'Iliad' could never have been assigned to them by a poet who was celebrating the events of his own time, or of a time very near to his own. The dream of an age when gods had mingled in the life of men did not, indeed, imply so remote a past to the mind of the Greeks as to be inconsistent with many of the social and political conditions which they still saw around them. We have seen that, for Hecataeus, four or five centuries sufficed. This 'heroic age' might be compared with the 'age of chivalry' as imagined by a modern reader who should derive his idea of it exclusively from Sir Walter Scott. The vista was not indefinitely long; but the perspective was essential to the illusion.

* Her. ii. 143.

† Her. viii. 84.

While, then, the plain of Ilium had undoubtedly been the theatre of warfare between Greek invaders and older occupants of the country, we hold that nothing can be either affirmed or denied as to the historical character of particular events or persons in the 'Iliad'; though it may be allowed as probable on general grounds that a great Achæan chief once held the position—perhaps bore the name—of Agamemnon. We hold, further, that the events of the 'Iliad' were imagined by the poet as long past, though not so remote as to debar him from painting (perhaps with modifications) the political and social life which he knew. Now we will ask how much help the 'Iliad' gives us towards identifying the site of the Homeric Ilium. However much or little of historical fact may be embedded in the poem, perhaps it will at least enable us to say—This, and no other, must be the scene which lived before the poet's mind. The topographical data of the 'Iliad' fall into two main groups. The first group relates to Ilium itself. The second illustrates the position of Ilium with regard to certain features of the surrounding country.

Ilium is conceived by the poet as 'a great town' (*μέγα ἄστυ*), 'with broad streets' (*εὐρυαγυῖα*). It had an acropolis ('the 'Pergamus'), rising in a slope* above the rest of the town; and here was Priam's house of polished stone, with twelve chambers for his daughters and their husbands, and fifty for his sons and their wives. The agora was before the doors of Priam's house. On the same acropolis or 'Pergamus' stood also the 'well-built' house of Hector and the 'fair house' of Paris (including a courtyard and a hall): further, the temple of Pallas Athene, guardian goddess of Troy; a temple of Apollo; and either a temple or an altar of Zeus. The town was fenced round with a strong wall, which had parapets and several towers. The only town-gate mentioned is that which is called sometimes the 'Scæan' gate (*Σκαῖαί πύλαι*), sometimes the 'Dardanian.' It seems to have had a west or north-west aspect, and 'Scæan' has usually been explained as 'on the left hand' of the augur who faces the north. Martin Haug thought, however, that the name of a hero Sigo or Siko can be traced in Scæan, as in 'Sigeum,' 'Scamander,' Dido's 'Sichæus,' and the Phœnician 'Sigon' of Arrian. Before this Scæan gate stood the tree called *φηγός*—always supposed to be a *quercus esculus*, but taken by Professor Virchow to be the *carpinus betulus* still abundant in the Troad,—the 'white beech' (*Weiss-Hagebuche*) of Germany.

* Il. xxiv. 699.

A wild fig-tree (*erineos*) is also named as standing somewhere near the town, at a place where the wall was most easy to mount: i.e., perhaps, where some ground sloped up towards it.

For the position of Ilium in regard to the surrounding country we have only a few general data. South and south-east of it the 'Ilian Plain' spread to the lower slopes of Ida;* to the north and north-west, the plain which was the battlefield of the heroes extended to the Hellespont, having in its north-western part what is called the *θρῶσμος πεδίοιο*—'the rise of the plain,' or, as Dr. Schliemann would render it, since this rise is actually very slight, 'the upper plain.' A carriage-road (*ἀμαξιτός*†) led from the Scaean gate in a north-west direction to 'the two springs' (*πηγαί*) of the river Scamander in the plain. At no great distance beyond there was a ford over the Scamander, and a point at which the stream of the Scamander was joined by that of the Simois. Wheat was grown in the plain not far from Ilium; but the ground nearest the city on the west and north-west sides was a swamp with a thick growth of marshy shrubs and reeds. The cry of the heron—as if rising from these marshes—is heard by Odysseus as he sallies forth from the Greek camp with Diomedes.‡ When the god Ares, 'like to the dark storm,' cries aloud to the Trojans that they should fight, he urges them at one time 'from the topmost citadel,' at another, 'speeding beside the 'Simois, on Callicolonè.'§ There are two heights near the Simois sufficiently important to be identified with 'the fair 'mount' along which Ares sped. One is Mount Kara Your (686 feet), hitherto the reputed Callicolonè. Professor Virchow has deposed it from its traditional honours, and substituted Mount Oulou Daglı (1,409), for the somewhat unsatisfactory reason that the latter can be seen from Novum Ilium (p. 59), and the former cannot. Accepting Oulou Daglı, however, we have no new datum for the exact position of Troy. Lastly, three tumuli are mentioned. One is that 'which men 'call Baticia, but immortals the tomb of fleet Myrinè.' This is 'a high mound,' in front of the city, 'some way off' in the plain, and with a free space around it. Then, somewhere between the town and the Greek camp, there was the tumulus (*τύμβος*) of Æsyetes, on which Polites, son of Priam, sits watching for the Greeks to attack.¶ And the mound or tomb

* Il. xxi. 558.

† Il. xxii. 146.

‡ Il. x. 274.

§ Il. xx. 51–53.

¶ Il. ii. 791.

of Ilius, where the Trojans with Hector encamped by night, was between the Scamander and the ships.*

Such are the chief data which the '*Iliad*' gives us. We do not enter on the topographical arguments which have been extorted from minute estimates of time and distance in regard to the actions of the '*Iliad*.' Reasonings of this kind start from the assumption that an epic poem is constructed on the principles of an Ordnance Survey, but are apt to differ from that model in the arbitrary use of inconsistent scales. There are not more than two arguments of this nature which can be allowed as valid, and the result of these is far from precise. First, the site of Homeric Ilium must be such that the space between it and the coast of the Hellespont shall be large enough for the flight and pursuit of armies, but not too wide for the accomplishment of some movements to which the '*Iliad*' assigns an approximately definite duration. This consideration is in favour of Dr. Schliemann's site, Hissarlik, as against Bunarbashi, but is less decisive as between Hissarlik and Strabo's site, 'the village of the Ilians,' at Atchi-kôî. Then the Achilles of the '*Iliad*' chases Hector round the walls. This possibility exists at Hissarlik, but not, according to Dr. Schliemann, at Bunarbashi. Dr. Schliemann tried the experiment himself, but was forced to finish it in a different attitude from that of Achilles. Towards the end of his career round this conceivable though improbable Troy, he was, in fact, compelled by the difficulties of the ground to go, as he tells us, 'on all fours'†

The evidence of the '*Iliad*,' then, gives us only very general indications for the position of Ilium. The central and capital feature is the Pergamus. Wherever we place the poet's town there must at least be an eminence, which could represent the acropolis of 'lofty Ilios.' But there is no sufficiently accurate measure for the bearings of the Homeric city from Ida, from the coasts, or from the rivers of the plain. We may allow that Bunarbashi seems too distant from the Hellespont for parts of the action. We may grant also that it would have been difficult or impossible to run round its walls. Both these points may be conceded in favour of Hissarlik. But the nature of our data still does not enable us to say that precisely Hissarlik, and no other spot, is the site intended by the '*Iliad*.'

All this time we have been tacitly granting that the local indications given in the '*Iliad*' were true to the facts. If they were in any degree fanciful, so far, of course, time would

be merely wasted in attempting to verify them by the natural features of the Troad. Now, if there is any proposition concerning the 'Iliad' which has obtained nearly universal assent, it is that those lays of Æolic bards on which it was based were worked into artistic form by an Ionian poet, or by Ionian poets, whose native region was far south of the Trojan battlefield. We can readily allow that in the original Æolic lays the dominant features of the scene—Ida, the Pergamus, the Simois, the Scamander—were given once for all. But what certainty can be felt that an Ionian poet unfamiliar with the Troad—perhaps a stranger to it—was absolutely accurate in localising minor touches of the picture? Who can be sure that he was not a little hazy as to the position of the famous wild fig-tree, that he fixed correctly in their relative positions the tombs of Myrinè, Ilus, and Æsyetes, or that he always accommodated the action of his epic to the real distance between the Achæan ships and the Scæan gates? And if it is once allowed that the Troy of the Iliad is an imaginary city, created by the poet in the likeness of later cities which he had seen, the attempt to recognise it in remains found at Hissarlik becomes futile.

This brings us to the most remarkable—we had almost said, the most astonishing—characteristic of Dr. Schliemann's book. Surely, it might have been anticipated, so indefatigable an enthusiast for all things Homeric would ere now have formed his opinion on a question which goes to the very root of all his researches—the question whether Homer was contemporary with Homeric Troy, or lived long after the age of which he sang. Or, if it proved impossible to form a decided opinion, at least it might have been expected that he would abstain from arguing from the two opposite conclusions alternately. Yet this, as we shall proceed to show, is what Dr. Schliemann does. Close to the so-called tumulus of Achilles in the Troad there is another tumulus which is called that of Patroclus.

'This identification,' says Dr. Schliemann (p. 648), 'must be quite modern, it being in perfect opposition to the precise statement of Homer, who puts in the mouth of Achilles the words: "Let us wrap the bones (of Patroclus) in a double layer of fat, and put them in a golden urn, until I also am hidden with Hades. Now do not make the tumulus large, but only of becoming size. Later, you Achæans, who shall survive me on the ships with the many rowing-benches, may make it wide and high."*' Ilios companions obeyed: having gathered the bones of Patroclus, they wrapped them in a double

layer of fat, and put them in a golden urn, which they brought into the tent, and covered with a soft linen cloth. They then marked out the round place for the tumulus, laid the foundations around the funeral pile, and heaped up the earth. Having completed the tumulus, they departed.* Now, in all this there is not a word to show that the golden urn which contained the bones of Patroclus was either deposited in the tumulus, or was meant to be ever deposited there. All that we can possibly understand here is that on the death of Achilles his bones should be added to those of Patroclus in the golden urn, and that on that event the tumulus should be enlarged, but there is no allusion whatever to the depositing of the urn. Had it been deposited, or had it been destined to be deposited there, Homer would not have kept back from us the important fact.'

This whole argument is unmeaning, unless Homer is supposed to have the authority of an historian, and that, too, in regard to the most minute details. But since, from the nature of the case, we are forbidden to suppose the accurate transmission of these minute details by written history, Homer could possess such authority only through having been contemporary with Patroclus, or, indeed, an eyewitness of his funeral. Then Dr. Schliemann found at Hissarlik, in the stratum which he now calls the Third Prehistoric City, and identifies with the Homeric Ilium, a number of objects which he identifies with objects described in the 'Iliad.' One is a goblet with two handles. Here, he says, we have Homer's *δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον* (p. 535). Another is a gold diadem. This, he says, is clearly Homer's *πλεκτηὶ ἀναδέσμη* (p. 457). Now in the strata above the Third City he recognises a Fourth and a Fifth Prehistoric City; on the top of the fifth, a Lydian settlement; and on the top of that, nearest the surface of Hissarlik, the Greek Ilium. The evidence by which these successive cities are discriminated turns partly on the character of the pottery and the ornaments or implements found in successive strata, as implying certain differences of social life and civilisation. Hence it is manifest that an object known as a *δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον* to a dweller in the third city would not necessarily be a *δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον* to the man of city No. 4, 5, 6, or 7. There is, then, no valid reason for identifying these objects with the Homeric names, unless we refer Homer himself to the stratum in which the objects were found, i.e. to the age in which they were used. But in another place Dr. Schliemann tells us that Homer lived long after that age—nay, that the city of which the remains form the uppermost stratum at Hissarlik had probably arisen before Homer lived!

* Il. xxiii. 252 f.

The passage is so remarkable that it must be quoted (the italics are our own):—

‘I wish I could have proved Homer to have been an eye-witness of the Trojan war! Alas, I cannot do it! At his time swords were in universal use and iron was known, whereas they were totally unknown at Troy [*i.e.* there are no traces of iron in the stratum which Dr. Schliemann identifies with Homer's Troy]. Besides, the civilisation he describes is *later by centuries* than that which I have brought to light in the excavations. Homer gives us the legend of Ilium's tragic fate as it was handed down to him by preceding bards, clothing the traditional facts of the war and destruction of Troy in the garb of his own day. Neither will I maintain that his acquaintance with the Troad and Troy was that of a resident; but certainly he was not without personal knowledge of the localities, for his descriptions of the Troad in general, and of the Plain of Troy in particular, are too truthful for us to believe that he could have drawn all his details from the ancient myth. *If, as appears likely, he visited the Plain in the ninth century B.C., he would probably have found the Æolic Ilium already long established*, having its acropolis on Hissarlik and its lower town on the site of Novum Ilium. It would therefore be but natural that he should depict Priam's Troy as a large city, with an acropolis called Pergamos, the more so as in his time every larger city had its acropolis. My excavations have reduced the Homeric Ilium to its real proportions.’ (P. 517.)

The ‘Homeric Ilium,’ then, is not an Ilium which Homer knew, but an Ilium which, in his time, already lay buried under no less than four successive cities. In Homer's imagination it became something quite different from what it had really been. What purpose then is served by attempting to identify remains found in this buried Ilium with objects described in the ‘Iliad’? Again, the civilisation described in the ‘Iliad’ is said by Dr. Schliemann to be ‘later by many centuries’ than that of which vestiges occur in ‘the third city.’ How can this be proved? The civilisation of the ‘Iliad’ is doubtless higher; in respect of age, however, it may have been, not ‘centuries later,’ but centuries earlier.

A particular instance will serve to show the extraordinary confusion of thought which pervades Dr. Schliemann's treatment of this subject. Among the remains found in the stratum of the third city were some walls exhibiting the ground-plan of a house. As this house, though of modest size, was the largest of which traces could be found, Dr. Schliemann attributes it to the town-chief or king. The town being the Homeric Ilium, this, then, must answer to Priam's palace; though the latter was clearly at some distance from the Scæan gate, whereas this house stood close to the gate of the town. But

Priam's palace is described by Homer as 'adorned with polished corridors, in which were fifty chambers built of polished stone, all side by side. There the sons of Priam slept with their wedded wives. Facing these, on the other side of the court within, were built twelve covered chambers, side by side, of polished stone,' for Priam's daughters and their husbands. Now the house found by Dr. Schliemann had on the ground-floor just four rooms, measuring respectively 24 feet 4 inches by 12 feet, 12 feet 3½ inches by 7 feet 4 inches, 10 feet by 8 feet, and 7 feet 6 inches by 4 feet 6 inches,—all of which seem to have been used as store-rooms. How was this to be reconciled with the 'Iliad'? 'Homer,' says Dr. Schliemann, 'can never have seen the Troy whose tragic fate he describes, because at his time, and probably ages before his time, the city he glorifies was buried beneath mountains of *débris*. In his time public edifices, and probably also royal mansions, were built of polished stones; he therefore attributes the same architecture to Priam's mansion, magnifying it with 'poetic license' (p. 326). A perfectly intelligible view. But then Dr. Schliemann cannot shake off the opposite belief, that Homer is an historian describing things as they were. And so on the very next page he actually tries to show that the 'royal mansion' with the four store-rooms on the ground-floor may, 'with its dependencies,' have contained even more than a hundred rooms, smaller or larger (p. 327). Now, supposing 'the dependencies'—whatever they may have been—to have contained about half of these rooms, it will appear that 'the royal mansion' itself must have been about twelve stories high; and had this been so, surely, to use Dr. Schliemann's words, 'Homer would not have kept back from us the important fact.'

But, however Dr. Schliemann's Homeric theories may be estimated, he has at least proved by digging that the mound of Hissarlik had been a seat of human habitation from a remote period. In describing his discoveries, Dr. Schliemann begins with the lowest stratum, and thence ascends to the uppermost. We prefer to reverse that process, because, by beginning on the surface, we have the advantage of starting from a chronological epoch which can be approximately fixed.

The mound of Hissarlik was the acropolis of the Greek Ilium, which modern writers, without any ancient authority, call 'New Ilium.' Here stood a handsome temple of Athene—built by Lysimachus (about 300 B.C.) to replace an older shrine—of which only the foundations can be traced. The lower part of the town extended east and south of the mound.

The latest coins found at Hissarlik are of Constantius II. (361–337 A.D.). A Greek letter, first published in the ‘*Hermes*,’* from a manuscript of the fourteenth century, purports to be written by the Emperor Julian, and to describe a visit to Ilium which has been fixed to the interval between December, 354, and October, 355 A.D. If this letter could be assumed to be authentic, or even of contemporary origin, it would prove that the city of Ilium, with its temples and other monuments, was in good preservation about the middle of the fourth century A.D. After this it disappears from history; for, though Ilium gave its name to a bishopric in the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus (911–959 A.D.), it cannot be shown to have been the episcopal seat. Ancient tradition placed the foundation of the city not later than about 560 B.C., but inclined to a much earlier date: Dr. Schliemann himself holds that, in the *ninth* century B.C., it had already been ‘long’ established (p. 517).

Here, then, in the first place, is an undoubted historical site, on which we might be prepared to find remains of all ages from at least 560 B.C. to 400 A.D. But, in Dr. Schliemann’s view, the remains of the Greek Ilium belong only to the uppermost stratum, to which he allows a depth of only some six feet. Below the first stratum he discerns no less than six other strata. These, he holds, represent six different cities, the latest of which was a Lydian settlement; that is, was certainly anterior to the overthrow of the Lydian monarchy by Cyrus (*circ.* 546 B.C.), and may, he suggests, be referred to the reign of Gyges (*circ.* 698–660 B.C.).† It is not easy to reconcile this view with his other view, just quoted, that the Greek Ilium, which succeeded the Lydian settlement, had been built before the ninth century B.C.‡ The first question which occurs is naturally this: By what tests does Dr. Schliemann discriminate the six successive cities, beneath the uppermost, which he refers to the successive strata?

Immediately below the Greek Ilium, at a depth of $6\frac{1}{2}$ feet, Dr. Schliemann recognises the remains of ‘a Lydian city.’ What is the evidence for it? ‘All I am able to show of this ‘city,’ he says, ‘is its pottery: there is no wall of defence, nor ‘even any house-walls which I could with any degree of probability attribute to it’ (p. 587). ‘As neither the Greeks, nor ‘the prehistoric peoples who succeeded each other on the hill of ‘Hissarlik, *ever made such pottery*, and especially as this pottery ‘occurs in such abundance, it evidently points to a settlement

* ix. 257–266.

† P. 587.

‡ P. 517.

‘of a different people.’ That is, if, in excavating a mound, we find at $6\frac{1}{2}$ feet pottery of a somewhat different kind from that which we find at 6 feet or at 13 feet, we may, without further proof, conclude that here was a city distinct from two others, one above and one below it. But, besides the pottery, Dr. Schliemann can produce two other witnesses for the Lydian city. One is a small disc of ivory, with intaglio-work, representing a scorpion between two animals.

‘As nothing like it was found in the *débris* of any of the first five prehistoric cities or in the ruins of the *Æolic Ilium*, whilst in the artistic style of the intaglio there is at least some analogy to that of the head No. 1,391, and the cow-head No. 1,405, I attribute it with much confidence to the Lydian city.’ (P. 601.)

Nor is this all. There is also a small iron knife.

‘As not the slightest trace of iron has ever been found by me in any of the five prehistoric cities of Troy or Mycenæ; as, moreover, the shape of this knife is so widely different from the shape of all other knives found in these cities, whilst it has the very greatest similarity to the Etruscan knives, and also to the blade of a bronze knife found in the necropolis of Rovio, as well as to a bronze knife found in the tombs of Soldo near Alzate (Brianza), I am forced to attribute it to the Lydian city.’ (P. 604.)

Such, then, are the proofs of ‘the Lydian city.’ We proceed to consider the grounds on which he distinguishes, beneath ‘the Lydian city,’ another—the fifth from the bottom, and hence designated as ‘the fifth prehistoric city.’ At a depth of about $6\frac{1}{2}$ to 13 feet below the surface was found ‘a layer of *débris*,’ ‘evidently consisting of the remains of houses built of wood and clay.’ Just below these, at a depth of 13 to 23 feet, remains of stone buildings were found. Dr. Schliemann assumes that the people who used the stone cannot possibly have used the wood and clay also. He therefore imagines ‘the fifth prehistoric city’ to account for the wood and clay, and ‘the fourth prehistoric city’ to account for the stone. There is absolutely no other ground for the hypothesis. A large number of stone axes were found in the so-called ‘Fourth City’ (13 to 23 feet down); two stone axes were found above these, one of them at 6 feet. Dr. Schliemann says, ‘I attribute it to this Fifth City, as it was found at a depth of ‘only 6 feet’ (p. 573). But why, then, not attribute it to the Greek Ilium, of which the stratum reaches down to 6 feet, or at least to ‘the Lydian city,’ which appears at $6\frac{1}{2}$ feet? The stones for bruising grain (‘saddle-querns’) which occur in the stratum of the ‘Fourth City’ occur in that of the ‘Fifth City’ also—only in smaller numbers. The patterns of pottery

are much the same in both 'strata.' But we are told that 'the life of the people to which this stratum (and that of 'the "Fifth City"') belonged was entirely different from that of 'their predecessors.' And here is the difference: 'Instead of 'throwing all their kitchen remains on the floor of their rooms, 'they carried them away and shot them from the mound, since 'we but very rarely see in this stratum of *débris* the shells of 'oysters or mussels, which visitors may see in such really stupendous masses in the houses of the fourth city' (p. 574). In presence of the argument from the oyster-shells, we can but quote the verse of the poet in reference to the ostracism of Hyperbolus—*οὐ γὰρ τοιούτων οὐνεκ' ὄστραχ' εὐρέθη*. Oyster-shells, however numerous, will not sustain the weight of such conclusions.

But if 'the fifth' and 'the fourth' cities are imagined on wholly insufficient grounds, more baseless still is the distinction of the 'fourth' city from the 'third.' Dr. Schliemann finds his 'third prehistoric city' at a depth of 23 to 33 feet below the surface. This is the city which he identifies with Homer's Troy. He supposes it to have been destroyed by fire, with the exception of the south-east corner. The criterion by which he distinguishes it from the 'fourth prehistoric city,' the next above it, is simply the use of brick. As he himself says with emphasis, there is no other reason for distinguishing them:—

'We find among the successors of the burnt city the very same singular idols; the very same primitive bronze battle-axes; the very same terra-cotta vases, with or without tripod feet; the very same double-handled goblets (*δέπα ἀμφικύπελλα*); the very same battle-axes of jade, porphyry, and diorite; the same rude stone hammers and saddle-querns of trachyte; the same immense mass of whorls or balls of terra-cotta with symbolical signs.'

This being so, it is not surprising that Dr. Schliemann should confess 'a tendency to believe that this fourth city 'might have been inhabited by the people of the preceding, 'the burnt city' (p. 520). He resists this tendency, however, because bricks are found at a depth of 23 to 33 feet, but not at 13 to 23 feet. But his belief in the infallibility of the brick-test might have been shaken by a fact which he himself records. In the third or 'brick' city itself, certain parapets of a gate are described as built partly with slabs of white limestone, partly with 'small stones of reddish colour' (p. 266). Dr. Schliemann ascribes the limestone part of these parapets to the people of the city which came next *before* the 'brick' city: though he says elsewhere that the site of the second city 'must have been deserted for a long

'time before it was again built upon' (p. 305). The masonry of reddish stones he ascribes to the people of the 'brick city' (p. 266). So, then, they used stone as well as brick. The use of brick will not then, by itself, suffice to distinguish the 'third' city from 'fourth;' but, as we have already seen, there is no other test (p. 520). With regard to some pottery, ascribed to 'the fourth city,' Dr. Schliemann says that it would have been but slightly inferior to that of its predecessor, the third city, had it not been through the accidentally superior baking of the latter in the conflagration (p. 521). But, since he supposes that part of the third city was not burnt (p. 313), why should this pottery not be ascribed to that quarter of it which escaped the fire?

It only remains to notice the 'second' and the 'first' prehistoric cities—as Dr. Schliemann terms the two strata which he discerns below the 'brick' or 'burnt' city. The 'second city' is at a depth of 33 to 45 feet below the surface; the 'first,' at 45 to 52½ feet. Below this is the native rock. The distinction between the 'second' and the 'first' city is one which Dr. Schliemann did not draw in his earlier work, 'Troy and its Remains' (1874). There, he regarded the whole thickness of 23 feet below his 'burnt' city as belonging to one and the same prehistoric settlement. He now divides this stratum into two strata on the strength of certain supposed differences in the pottery and in the architecture of house-walls. At a depth of 45 to 52 feet were found certain lustrous-black bowls, with double tubular piercings, either horizontal or vertical, on both sides of the rim. No fragments of such bowls happen to occur at the depth of 33 to 45 feet; while there, on the other hand, are found some large terra-cotta jars. Not a shadow of a reason is given for believing that the people who made the bowls could not have made the jars; for, even if we grant that the jars could have been made only by people who possessed 'the experience of centuries' in the ceramic art (p. 279), does not Dr. Schliemann himself say, that if ceramic skill could be taken as the gauge of civilisation, then, 'the *first* city was by far the most civilised; because its pottery shows, both in 'fabric and shape, by far the most advanced art'? (p. 214). The argument from the architecture of the house-walls is, if possible, still less satisfactory. In the first place the data are exceedingly scanty. 'To my great regret,' says Dr. Schliemann, 'I have been able to excavate comparatively little of 'these two lowest cities, as I could not bring them to light 'without completely destroying the burnt city'—the next

above them. So the masonry of the 'first' city has to be judged from the foundations of three house-walls, composed of small uncut stones joined with earth (p. 212). The masonry of the 'second' city is supposed to be exhibited by some slight remains of walls built 'in regular layers of large, but 'slightly wrought quadrangular blocks of limestone, which 'are joined together by small ones.' Why, we ask, should not the same city have contained some house-walls built with 'small uncut stones,' and other walls built with 'large but 'slightly wrought blocks?' On the other hand, one characteristic feature is common, it seems, to the architecture of the 'first,' 'second,' and even 'third' cities—the use of large cakes of hardened clay (*galettes*) to supply inequalities of the ground and to make a level bed for courses of stone (pp. 213, 269). Thus both the arguments for distinguishing the 'first' from the 'second' city prove, on examination, to be altogether illusory.

The foregoing summary—which, though necessarily concise, does not, we think, omit any relevant point—will show the method by which Dr. Schliemann's theory has been found. Taking the objects found at a certain depth—say, at from $6\frac{1}{2}$ to 13 feet below the surface—he constructs from them a definite conception of the whole life lived by the people to whom these objects belonged. If a little higher up or lower down—at a depth, suppose, of 13 to 23 feet—precisely similar objects are not found, or are found in a much smaller or much larger quantity, he infers that here we have the remains of a distinct city, or even of a distinct race. The fallacy of this procedure is twofold. First, the remains actually found are not in any of his strata sufficient to warrant such comprehensive and rigidly precise inferences as he draws from them. Secondly, the negative argument from the absence or rarity of certain objects is applied in a manner which the conditions of the case totally fail to justify. No help, it may be observed, has yet been gained from inscriptions, or supposed inscriptions, on objects found in the lower strata at Hissarlik.*

* Gomperz several years ago recognised the characters of the Cyprian syllabary on objects found at Hissarlik. In an appendix to 'Ilios' Professor A. H. Sayce attempts to develop this idea. An oriental scholar, writing in the New York 'Nation' (No. 815, p. 95, Feb. 10, 1881), has shown at length that Mr. Sayce has here made a large number of serious errors as to the Cyprian characters, and a still greater number of baseless assumptions. Readers of Mr. D. B. Monro's article, 'Traces of Different Dialects in the Language of 'Homer' ('Journal of Philology,' vol. ix. p. 252) are aware that Mr.

Sober criticism turns from the long series of 'prehistoric cities' to the historical city which, at any rate, occupied the site of Hissarlik. How far can the records of the Greek Ilium help to throw light on Dr. Schliemann's discoveries?

Strabo says that it was founded 'in the time of the Lydians,'* or, more precisely, 'about the time of Cræsus.'† Recent researches have placed it beyond reasonable doubt that, for about five centuries, the empire of Lydia was in vassalage to Nineveh.‡ The last great Lydian dynasty—that of the Mermnadæ—began to reign about 720 B.C., and closed with the overthrow of Cræsus about 546 B.C. The extreme limits thus indicated for the origin of the Greek Ilium are from about 1100 to 560 B.C.; and we may at least conclude that it was believed to have arisen while Lydia was still prosperous. The fact that the latest date assigned falls in the reign of the latest Lydian king argues that the Greek Ilium had some well-attested Lydian traditions or characteristics; hence it was felt that the town must have been founded at least before the destruction of the Lydian power. This should be carefully remembered, since it helps to account for those objects, found by Dr. Schliemann, which he refers to a 'Lydian settlement,' and also to explain the traces which he has observed of a 'prehistoric' intercourse with the east; for the Lydians were by land what the Phœnicians were by sea—the great carriers between East and West.

If Ilium had been a considerable place in the Lydian age, it had ceased to be so before 400 B.C. Xerxes, on his march from Sardis to Abydos, visits 'the Pergamon of Priam,' and sacrifices to the Ilian Athene; sixty years later (411 B.C.) the Spartan admiral Mindarus is found worshipping at the same shrine, and thence viewing a naval action in the Hellespont. A few years later, when Dercyllidas enters the Troad and challenges the towns which were held by Greek garrisons for the satrap Pharnabazus, Ilium, though a walled town, is one of three places which surrender at the first summons (399 B.C.). It still has fortifications in 359 B.C., when the Athenian Chari-demus holds it for a short while. After the battle of Granicus (334 B.C.), Alexander, as became a descendant of Achilles,

Sayce's treatment of Greek philology exhibits the same characteristics. In the interests of scholarship—which ceases to be a science when it disregards the principles of evidence—it is much to be regretted that confused guess-work should be thus hastily put forth as verified fact.

* Strabo, xiii. 42.

† Ib. 25.

‡ E. Curtius, 'Hist. Gr.,' book i. ch. i.

adorned its temple with votive offerings, conferred upon it the title of *city*, and directed that it should be embellished with new public buildings,* while he declared it free, and exempt from taxes. Lysimachus, on acquiring north-western Asia Minor after the battle of Ipsus (301 B.C.), became the second great benefactor of Ilium. He repaired the temple, surrounded the city with a wall of five miles in circumference,† and incorporated with it some decayed townships of the neighbourhood. After the death of Lysimachus (281 B.C.), Ilium appears to have decayed. The statement of Hegesianax that the Gauls found Ilium without walls and useless as a fortress, refers to their temporary occupation of the Troad about 278 B.C. About 216 B.C. it was besieged by the Gauls, whom Attalus of Pergamus had invited as mercenaries into Asia, but was relieved by the people of Alexandria Troas.‡ When the Romans entered Asia Minor, and at the battle of Magnesia broke the power of Antiochus the Great (190 B.C.), Ilium was nothing more than a petty country town.§ So squalid and neglected was the place, that the houses had not even tiled roofs—as we learn on the authority of an eye-witness, Demetrius of Scepsis in the Troad, who had seen it in this state as a boy.¶ After the defeat of Antiochus, the Romans confirmed the liberties of those free Greek cities which had been their allies in the war, and restored freedom to those which had been tributary to Antiochus or to local dynasts. Thus the towns of Dardanus and Ilium regained their freedom.¶ Alexander the Great had been favourably disposed to Ilium by his supposed descent from Achilles; the Romans, who traced their lineage from Æneas, had a still more direct interest in the ancient home of the Trojans. It is in connection with this period (about 189 B.C.) that Strabo speaks of ‘a great reparation’** at Ilium. But the chapter of its vicissitudes was not yet closed. In the First Mithridatic War, the legate, Fimbria, attacked Ilium as one of the Greek towns friendly to Sulla. Though he commanded the army of the murdered consul, Valerius Flaccus, Ilium held out against him for ten days: a proof that at this time, it was a place of considerable strength (85 B.C.). Its fate was such as might have been expected from the almost insane violence of Fimbria’s character: the town was left a heap of ruins. After the treaty between

* Strab. xiii. 26, οἰκοδομίας ἀναλαβεῖν.

† Ib.

‡ Polyb. v. 111.

§ κωμόπολις, Strab. xiii. 27.

¶ Ib.

¶ Mommsen, Hist. ii. 275.

** ὕστερον δ’ ἐπανόρθωσιν ἔσχε πολλήν: l. c.

Sulla and Mithridates, Sulla took care to compensate the principal sufferers from this vindictive frenzy. While the islanders of Chios received free charters and other favours, he 'consoled the Ilians,' in Strabo's phrase, 'with large reparations' of their town.*

Thenceforth Ilium appears to have enjoyed a modest but continuous prosperity. The rise of the Julian house gave a new prominence to the legend of Troy. Roman loyalty and imperial favour conspired to sanctify the reputed cradle of the race and of its Cæsars. This tendency finds its most famous and most brilliant expression in the 'Æneid;' but takes a form which, as being strictly prosaic, is perhaps more remarkable, in the Roman History of Dionysius. How the town of Ilium benefited by it, Strabo tells us in the characteristic passage where he compares the obligations of Ilium to Alexander and to Augustus. Alexander, in the favours which he bestowed, desired to renew the 'record of his descent' (from Pyrrhus), and at the same time to attest his love of Homer. But 'Cæsar the god,' says Strabo, 'has conferred 'much greater benefits on the Ilians.' Augustus was stirred by admiration of Alexander, as Alexander by admiration of Homer; † while he had also 'more notable proofs of kinship' with Troy than any that Alexander could show. Thus 'he 'was impelled to exhibit his beneficence with a princely spirit. ' . . . He granted additional territory to the Ilians, while he 'confirmed to them the freedom and the immunity from public 'burdens which they enjoy to this day.' The passage may have been written either before or soon after the death of Augustus in 14 A.D. Though new buildings are not expressly mentioned, it may reasonably be inferred that architectural repairs or improvements took place at this time. Pliny in the latter half of the first century notices the privileges of Ilium.‡ The tenth of the spurious Letters which bear the name of the orator Æschines relates a story of which the scene is laid at Ilium; and shows that, in the writer's time —i.e. probably in the first or second century A.D.—the place was a favourite resort of tourists, who could spend several days there without exhausting its interest. This kind of popularity doubtless lingered with Ilium to the latest days of paganism; it is indicated by the Greek letter ascribed to the Emperor Julian which has been already noticed. But the final

* παρεμυθήσατο πολλοῖς ἐπανορθώμασι: l. c. Cp. Mommsen, bk. iv. ch. viii. ad fin.

† φιλόμηρος—φιλαλέξανδρος: Strab. p. 594.

‡ Plin. v. 33.

decay of the town, we can hardly doubt, had set in before 400 A.D.

Such, in outline, is the known story of the site on which Dr. Schliemann has dug to a depth of $52\frac{1}{2}$ feet below the present surface. Now, as we have seen, this story—scant though its sources are—brings before us no fewer than five distinct occasions, separated by large intervals, on which new building operations certainly or probably took place at Ilium. 1. First, in 334 B.C., Alexander the Great took measures for the embellishment and aggrandisement of the town, which, though walled, was small and mean. 2. Between 301 and 281 B.C., Lysimachus further benefited and adorned it. 3. After the battle of Magnesia in 190 B.C., Ilium received favours from the Romans; and Strabo speaks of its ‘great reparation’ at this period. 4. Fimbria almost destroyed it in 85 B.C., and its people were then consoled by Sulla ‘with many reparations.’ 5. Augustus, at some time between 31 B.C. and 14 A.D., conferred on Ilium signal benefits, including an addition of territory, and doubtless some architectural repairs or embellishments.

These are the occasions which very imperfect information reveals; how many more there may have been, no one can say. And ancient tradition, resting on local evidence, carried back the origin of the Greek Ilium to a date at least earlier than the fall of the Lydian monarchy. We now ask: Given a town whose record goes back, on the lowest estimate, to a distance of four and twenty centuries, a town which, in the course of several centuries, repeatedly underwent restoration, reconstruction, enlargement at the hands of Macedonians, Greeks, and Romans, is it likely that the remains of such a town should reach to a depth of just six feet beneath the present surface of the soil? This is what Dr. Schliemann not merely assumes, but puts forward as ascertained historical truth. The first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth prehistoric settlement is habitually treated as if it had been a fact of the same kind as the Thames Embankment or the Haussmann Boulevard. In the name of science, but also with the most cordial sympathy for the enthusiasm which has animated Dr. Schliemann's researches, we must enter our protest against the extravagance of these assumptions. Their arbitrary nature may be illustrated by the ease with which, setting out from the same data, we might construct an equally dogmatic theory of a different kind. Beginning with Dr. Schliemann's lowest strata—from thirty-three to fifty-two and a half feet—in which, as we have seen, he finds traces of ceramic skill so great as, thus far, to argue very high civilisation—a theorist

might assume that here are the vestiges of the Greek Ilium in its earliest *Æolic* days—which Dr. Schliemann himself would place ‘long’ before the ninth century B.C.—when it arose during, and in close contact with, the Lydian Empire. Taking next the stratum of the third or burnt city, which is said to have been smaller and meaner than those before and after it, he would assume that this is the Greek Ilium in the interval of its insignificance from about 550 to 334 B.C. The rude architecture traceable here is, as Professor Virchow shows, just such as characterises the modern villages of the Troad (p. 314); and the ancient Ilium, though it had walls, was then a very poor place, little better than a village. The stratum next above this—where the architectural remains are of stone, not brick—will represent, for this new scheme, the building executed at Ilium when it was embellished by Alexander. In the three strata superimposed on this it will recognise the successive reparations of Ilium in later times—as by Lysimachus, Sulla, and Augustus. This outline of another theory is, of course, offered as an illustration only. One inference, however, rests on the strongest grounds of historical probability and topographical analogy. The remains of the *Æolic* Ilium surely cannot cease at six feet below the present surface of Hissarlik; how far down they reach, is a point which the data are not, in our opinion, nearly sufficient to determine with precision.

Even those who believe that to seek the very Troy of the ‘*Iliad*’ is to pursue a shadow can still feel a keen interest in enquiring what the ancient Greeks believed as to the site of the Homeric Troy. The Greek world of the historians, orators, and geographers had not reached those principles of criticism which, in our day, are alone recognised as scientific. The study of language, of history, of archæology had not yet been placed upon the basis of verified fact, or illuminated by the application of a comparative method. Wild, sometimes ludicrous, guesses as to the etymology of words are seriously recorded by such thinkers as Plato and Aristotle. When there is need of dealing with a point of historical criticism, relating to an age antecedent to the writer’s own, the shrewd simplicity of Herodotus is much on a level with the intellectual scepticism of Thucydides. The great intelligence and the wide reading of Strabo—who appears to have commanded all the information that the best literary sources could impart—does not give him, in this sense, any very marked superiority over a tourist who, like Pausanias, was well-nigh helpless in the hands of local guides. We might, then,

be disposed at once to dismiss the beliefs of the old Greek world on such a question as the site of the Homeric Troy. The unscientific character of old Greek criticism was never more conspicuously exemplified than in the treatment of the Homeric poems. But we think of one countervailing consideration; and we feel that some weight must be allowed to it in arrest of so summary a verdict. Those portions of Greek literature which have come down to us—scanty rivulets which have won their way through sands of time in which waters once abundant were lost—tell us of a source more copious than the rivers from which they descend. A mighty stream of oral tradition rolled its tide through the prehistoric centuries; it is but now and then that, in some verse of an old poet, in some casual phrase of a prose-writer, speaking of that which, in his day, was familiarly known, we catch some faint and far-off echo from this deep voice of the past, like the murmur in a sea-shell at the ear. A thousand minute traditions of which we have never heard, a thousand subtle testimonies which we cannot even imagine, may have helped to make the Greek of five hundred years before Christ say to himself with conviction—‘Homer’s Troy cannot have been *here*,—it must ‘have been *there*.’ Dr. Schliemann’s theory of the strata at Hissarlik requires him to suppose that Homer’s Troy was not completely destroyed—the south-east corner having escaped the fire which swept from south-east to north-east over this brick city. Very naturally, then, he is predisposed in favour of the view that the oldest Greek tradition admitted the partial preservation of Homeric Ilium. Again, he is of course anxious to show that the historic Greek Ilium was regarded by the old Greeks themselves as occupying the site of Homer’s Trojan Ilium. Neither of these points, as it seems to us, is really of much importance to Dr. Schliemann’s case. His appeal is to the spade. If the evidence of actual excavation is strong enough to support a theory, it is too strong to be upset by unvouched tradition; if it is not strong enough, then an unvouched tradition cannot make it so. But if we ask what, as a matter of fact, was the general belief of the old Greek world, there can be but one answer.

Almost unanimously the old Greeks believed that the Homeric Troy had been utterly destroyed by the Achæans, and that the Greek Ilium did not stand on the site of the Homeric Troy,—the latter having, from the time of the siege, remained desolate. The references to the Greek tradition are among the weakest parts of ‘*Ilios*.’ The Greek belief that Homeric Troy had been utterly destroyed is an inseparable part of the Trojan

legend. Nothing less, according to the ideas of ancient warfare, could expiate the deadly wrong which had led to the ten years' siege.* That the conquerors, when the long-deferred day of vengeance came, should have destroyed part of the town, but left one quarter of it standing for the use of any Trojans who might prefer to go on quietly living there, would have seemed to ancient Greeks not merely an absurd anticlimax, an inexplicable weakness, but a positive impiety towards those gods, the punishers of guilt, who had been the allies of the Achæans against the hostile gods of Troy. Dr. Schliemann has adopted this theory because it is convenient as explaining why the south-east corner of the 'brick' city was not burnt. In support of it he quotes 'Iliad' xx. 307, which is simply a prophecy that, since the house of Priam is doomed, that of Æneas shall reign over the Trojans. The testimony of the post-Homeric poets, who merely interpret the received tradition, is unanimous. It is enough to recall that lurid picture of utter havoc by fire and sword in the 'Agamemnon' of Æschylus, when Troy was 'levelled with the ground as by a mattock in the avenging hand of Zeus;' the words in which the Orestes of the 'Eumenides' reminds Athene of him 'with whom thou madest Troy, city of Ilium, to be no more a city;' Virgil's 'omnis humo fumat Neptunia Troia'; the prediction of Juno, in the ode of Horace, that the Capitol shall stand so long as cattle shall tread the grass, and wild beasts hide their cubs, in the burial-place of Priam and of Paris. An ingenious German critic gets over this by suggesting that the burial-place meant by Horace was 'perhaps in the secluded dales of Mount Ida' (p. 204). And Lucan, says the same critic, 'evidently makes Cæsar visit the Ilium of his time, and hold it to be the Homeric city. Of this, the verse

'Circuit exustæ nomen memorabile Troiæ'

'can hardly leave any doubt, because on the coast of Troy there existed only the city called Ilium or Troy, and no other of this name.' We ask in amazement whether the commentator had read the very next lines? Lucan goes on—

'Magnaue Phœbei quærit vestigia muri.
Jam silvæ steriles et putres robore trunci
Assaraci pressere domos, et templa deorum
Jam lassu radice tenent: ac tota teguntur
Pergama dumetis; etiam periære ruinæ.†

* See the description, in the 'Iliad' itself, of the incidents attendant on the sack of a town—*ἡγήδ' ὅσ' ἀνθρώποισι πέλει, τῶν ἄστυ ἀλώη* (ix. 588).

† Phars. x. 964.

Strabo, who throughout his thirteenth book takes the fact that Troy was 'razed from its foundations' * as one which ancient tradition affirmed, remarks that 'later writers also admit the ' utter destruction (*ἀφανισμόν*) of the city—among whom is ' the orator Lycurgus.'

Lycurgus is impeaching an Athenian citizen named Leocrates, who had fled from Athens immediately after the battle of Chæronea. By thus acting, says the speaker, Leocrates did what one man could towards involving Athens in total destruction. A city may be oppressed by tyrants, crippled by enemies, and may come through all these trials—as Athens had done—to better times. But when a city has once been made desolate,† it remains so. 'Who has not heard of Troy? ' Who does not know that Troy—once the greatest city of ' its age, and the queen of Asia—has remained for all time ' uninhabited, since once for all it was razed by the Greeks? ' Who does not know that Messene waited 500 years to be ' re-colonised by miscellaneous settlers?' ‡ Lycurgus was no careless rhetorician, but a man of grave character, a weighty, because a sober and thoughtful, speaker: his characteristic love of accuracy appears in his effort to rescue the works of the Attic dramatists from corruption by forming standard texts. And this speech was delivered not earlier than 332 B.C., perhaps in 330 B.C. Now, in 334 B.C. Alexander the Great, as we have seen, had honoured and benefited the inhabitants of the Greek Ilium on a most impressive occasion—just after his great victory at the Granicus. The deeds of Alexander were ringing through Greece: all men were eagerly following the smallest incidents of his Asiatic career. We ask, then, if the Greek Ilium was identified with Homeric Troy, how could Lycurgus have dared, in 332–30 B.C., to tell an Athenian assemblage that Troy had, 'through all time, remained uninhabited'? No proof, surely, could be more absolutely conclusive as to the belief held not only by the vulgar, but by those who were best qualified to judge, in an age of Greece which inherited all that oral or epic tradition could teach, while its instinct for the poetry of the Greek past had not yet ceased to be fresh and living.

The truth is that the identification of Homeric Troy with the Greek Ilium was, in the old Greek view, a paradox, which had no vitality except at Ilium itself. The inhabitants

* *ἐκ βάθρων ἀνατετραμμένης*, xiii. 38.

† *ἀνίστατον*. Plato uses the same explicit word in reference to the destruction of Homeric Troy: *Laws*, 682 D.

‡ In Leocr. §§ 61, 62.

of that place were very naturally anxious to keep up so glorious and lucrative a belief. Dr. Schliemann has himself given us the right measure of their authority on the question.

'The Ilians, who firmly believed in the ancient tradition that their town occupied the very site of ancient Troy, were proud to show in their Pergamum the house of Priam as well as the altar of Zeus Herkeios, where that unhappy old man had been slain, and the identical stone on which Palamedes had taught the Greeks to play at dice. They were so totally ignorant of archaeology, that they took it as an undoubted fact that the Trojans had walked on the very same surface of the soil as themselves, and that the buildings they showed were all that remained of the ancient city.' (P. 211.)

The Ilians may, then, we presume, be considered as out of court. But the identity of their town with Homeric Troy was further maintained by the chronicler Hellanicus, who flourished about 440 B.C. His motive, as Strabo bluntly says, was simply to ingratiate himself with the Ilians.* Now, as Hellanicus was a Mitylenæan, and as Lesbos, especially Mitylene, had long had the closest connections with the Troad, this view of the matter is, on the face of it, not improbable. And it is strongly confirmed by everything else that we know of Hellanicus. His tendency in the various works which he wrote on Bœotia, Thessaly, Argos, and many other regions, was everywhere to adopt the *local* legends (τὰ ἐπιχώρια), in preference to versions of events handed down by the poets or by common report. And, owing probably to this ready acceptance of statements due to local vanity, his authority stood so low that Ephorus, the contemporary of Aristotle, was able to speak of him as '*in most things* untruthful.'† Demetrius, of Scepsis in the Troad, wrote an elaborate commentary, in no less than thirty books, on the 'Catalogue' in the second book of the 'Iliad.' In this work he gave his reasons—based on a minute personal knowledge of the ground—for believing that the site of the Homeric Troy was not at the Greek Ilium, but a place known as 'the village of the Ilians,' between three and four miles to the west of it. In 'Troy and its Remains' (1874), Dr. Schliemann remarked that the views of Demetrius 'were suggested by vanity. . . . He envied 'Ilium the honour of having been the metropolis of the Trojan 'kingdom' (p. 41).‡ This assumption implies a very singular

* Strab. xiii. 42.

† Phot. *cod.* 72, p. 64 : ἐν πλείστοις ψευδόμενον.

‡ The writer of a short and somewhat disappointing 'appendix' on this subject amplifies this idea in the following singular terms :—'The

attitude of mind. It supposes that Demetrius would deliberately vitiate the labours of a lifetime in order to spite the inhabitants of a neighbouring town. Suppose that a native of Folkestone had devoted his life to composing an exhaustive work on the controversy as to where Julius Cæsar landed on the coast of Britain. He is secretly convinced, we will suppose, that it was somewhere on the Dover side of the South Foreland. But he has a deeply-rooted grudge against the corporation and burgesses of Dover. He cannot endure to bring the coveted distinction so near to them. He therefore argues, against his better conscience and to the ruin of his own work, that Julius Cæsar must have landed at Ramsgate. The absurdity of the 'malevolence' ascribed to Demetrius is heightened when we find that Scepsis, his own town, had a distinct and honourable place in his Homeric scheme, which effectually precluded it from even coming into competition with the Greek Ilium. Demetrius took Scepsis to have been the royal seat of Æneas.* And it further appears from Strabo that the theory of Demetrius was not peculiar to himself, but was that which was currently received, and which he had merely developed in fuller detail. Strabo says: 'A little further inland is the village of the Ilians, where *it is thought* (*νομίζεται*) that the ancient Ilium was formerly situated,—thirty stades from the present city.'† Again: '*It is conjectured* (*εικάζουσι*) that the later generation, when they thought of founding Ilium anew, shunned the old site as ill-omened, either on account of the disasters which had befallen there, or because Agamemnon, after the old custom, had cursed the ground.'‡

The force, in Greek writers, of such general expressions as *νομίζεται*, *εικάζουσι*, *λέγεται*, has been shown once for all by Bentley. In the Phalaris controversy, it was objected to him that, in one of the passages on which he relied for a date, the phrase was merely, *it is said* (*λέγεται*). Bentley replied by observing that this phrase 'is so far from being a token of want of evidence, that it is principally used upon the contrary account, when the generality of writers are agreed. When a single witness says a thing, he is commonly mentioned by name; but when the evidence is numerous, and

argument of Demetrius is *merely that of a malevolent pedant, who hated the Ilians on account of their recent good fortune, and sought to detract from their respectability* [sic] *on antiquarian grounds*! (P. 690.)

* Strabo, xiii. 53. † Ib. 35. ‡ Ib. 41. § II. vi. 434.

'cannot all be brought in, then they say λέγεται and φασί.' He then shows that the statement in question is found in seven other extant writers. Now the numerous other writers, besides Demetrius, whom Strabo quotes in reference to the Troad, are either not extant, or are represented only by scanty fragments. But when he says, 'it is thought,' 'it is conjectured,' we may be sure that, if they were extant, we should find the view of Demetrius shared by some or all of them.

In the general belief of the old Greek world, the Homeric Troy had been utterly destroyed, its site had remained desolate, and the Greek Ilium stood upon different ground. The bearing of this ancient tradition on Dr. Schliemann's results is a distinct question. He holds that his 'second pre-historic city' had long been deserted before the third, or brick city had been built. If any one of his strata could be identified with the Homeric Troy, it might be asked whether a better case could not be made out for this 'second' city than for the 'third' city above it. It might be urged that the long abandonment of the site was at least in harmony with the Greek tradition that Troy had been made desolate; that it was built of stone, and that the buildings in Homer's Troy are of stone; that it possessed a paved roadway (p. 306), which might be identified with the ἡμαξίτις of the 'Iliad'; and that certain features of the walls (p. 305) suggest the notice in the poem of a point at which the town-wall could be easily scaled. But the Troy of the 'Iliad' is in truth—as Dr. Schliemann has at times seen—a city of the poet's fancy; and all attempts at a precise identification of details are dreams that issue from the ivory gate.

To sum up. The excavations of Dr. Schliemann at Hissarlik have revealed traces of human habitation reaching to a depth of more than fifty feet below the soil. Near the surface are some remains of a distinctly Greek character. Lower down are other remains which are not Greek in character, and some which show a very rude state of civilisation, while *below* these are others which indicate a more advanced stage. The Greek Ilium which stood on this site had, according to Dr. Schliemann (p. 517), been 'already long established' 'in the ninth century B.C. ;' and no account puts its origin later than about 560 B.C. In successive centuries this Greek Ilium had passed through a long series of reparations or reconstructions under the most various circumstances. Further, it is known that the Troad had experienced many changes of population, being, as it was, a natural halting-place of migrants who had

just entered Asia or were about to pass over into Europe. Temporary settlements had been made in the Troad at a very early date by semi-barbarous Thracians, as later by the Gauls who swept over Europe; and the Turkish name of Hissarlik ('fortress') is itself enough to suggest the attraction which this particular site must always have possessed for warlike wanderers or colonists. Dr. Schliemann holds that the remains of the Greek Ilium, already 'long' established in 900-800 B.C., cease altogether at about six feet below the soil, and that everything found below the depth of six feet belongs to earlier prehistoric settlements. We, on the contrary, believe that the remains of the Greek Ilium, in one or another of the various phases through which the course of so many centuries carried it, reach to a greater, probably to a much greater, depth than six feet below the present surface; but that the evidence does not suffice to show at what precise point they cease. The lines drawn by Dr. Schliemann, formerly between five distinct strata, and now between no fewer than seven, seem to us, for the reasons which we have given, to be in a large measure arbitrary assumptions. The antiquity of the remains found in the lowest part of the excavations at Hissarlik cannot be exactly determined; but they may well be older than the epoch of the earliest *Æolic* settlements in the Troad,—say, than 1200 B.C. It must be remembered that no rigid line can be drawn, for Hissarlik, between an 'age of stone' and an 'age of bronze,' since implements of bronze occur not only above but also below implements of stone; indeed, the demarcation of such 'ages,' however applicable to prehistoric Germany and Scandinavia, cannot be applied with the same strictness to Greece and Asia. The objects found at Hissarlik indicate what the traditions of the Troad would have led us to expect, viz., that at a remote period this site was occupied by a comparatively civilised people (with high skill, for instance, in the ceramic art), who were succeeded by a people or by peoples whose level of civilisation was presumably not higher than that of the rudest Thracian or Gallic tribes. But the lower civilisation thus found during one period at Hissarlik may have been contemporary with a far higher civilisation in adjacent lands or even in the immediate neighbourhood. There is no reason why Thracians, for example, should not have held Hissarlik while *Æolic* Greeks were already settled on the shores of the Troad. The objects found in the lower part of the excavations at Hissarlik are non-Hellenic. The same may be said of remains at Mycenæ and Tiryns. But, because remains are non-Hellenic, it by no

means follows that they are pre-Hellenic. Nor can it be assumed, as Dr. Schliemann sometimes appears to assume, that no objects of non-Hellenic character would be found in a Hellenic settlement. On the contrary, it is highly probable that, in the early days of the Greek Ilium—even if we put its origin somewhat below Dr. Schliemann's date of *circa* 900 B.C.—most of the articles of luxury, or even of daily use, would have been products of oriental art or industry. The Greek Ilium, when it first arose, must certainly have been in close contact and in constant intercourse with the civilisation of Lydia, then the dominant influence of western Asia Minor; and everything that the commerce of the East had to offer would have found its way, through Lydia, to the Troad.

In relation to the 'Iliad,' the bearing of Dr. Schliemann's researches may be thus summarised. Once, at a period which may be roughly indicated by such limits as 1200—800 B.C., there was undoubtedly some hard fighting in the Troad between Æolic immigrants and older inhabitants. The capture by the Æolic warriors of a town called Ilium came afterwards to play a prominent part in the local Æolic legends of the Troad. By degrees many particular legends, glorifying many particular heroes or houses, grouped themselves around this favourite central incident. The siege of Troy thus came, in the course of generations, to be the nucleus of a complex tradition. The main features of the famous story, as gradually amplified in the lays of Æolic bards, were elaborated by the epic poetry of Ionia, until at last they assumed the mature artistic form, such as our 'Iliad' represents. The Ilium of the 'Iliad' is a city with a lofty acropolis, with spacious streets, with temples and palaces of wrought stone. The prehistoric Ilium recognised by Dr. Schliemann in the fifth of his strata at Hissarlik was a town with no acropolis, with an area about as large as that of Trafalgar Square, and with houses of which the largest—the presumed dwelling of royalty—contained four small store-rooms on the ground-floor. The 'Iliad,' it may be granted, probably preserves some leading features of the Æolic legend concerning the siege of Ilium,—what features it is impossible to define. As a picture, however, of the town Ilium over which Priam reigned it is a work of the fancy, influenced possibly by a few touches in the Æolic lays, but more largely and directly by handsome cities which the Ionian poet had seen, in days, perhaps, when some such city as Miletus was already 'the pride of Ionia.*' It is vain, then, to attempt

* *πρόσχημα τῆς Ἰωρῆς*: Her. v. 28.

an identification of particular details in Dr. Schliemann's discoveries with particular details in the 'Iliad.' It is also fallacious to regard these discoveries as tending to prove the historical character of the Trojan war, or of any persons connected with it. That which Dr. Schliemann has really proved may be stated in these terms:—A very ancient town, which may have been older than the earliest *Æolic* settlement, and which appears to have been partially destroyed by fire, once stood on the site represented by the mound of Hissarlik. If the capture of a real town in this plain formed the basis of fact on which the story of the 'Iliad' rests, then there is now a definite reason for placing that town at Hissarlik, whereas there is no similar reason for placing it at Bunarbashi or at Atchi-kôï.

Dr. Schliemann deserves the cordial gratitude of scholars for having devoted so much of his labour and his fortune to the prosecution of researches amid scenes consecrated by the immortal poetry of the past. His name will live as that of one in whom a genuine enthusiasm, springing from the memories of childhood, became in manhood the spirit of personal and indefatigable exploration. Even those who are unable to welcome him only because they believe that no seeker could ever be so welcomed—as the man who has laid bare the very portals through which Hector passed from the presence of Andromache to battle with Achilles, the very walls from which Helen looked in vain for her godlike brothers among the warriors of Achaia—even such will recognise in him the Galahad of this Trojan quest,—the knight to whom the vision would have come, if pure devotion could have achieved it. The ground on which the acropolis of the Greek Ilium stood has given up the buried remains of centuries; many objects have been found which furnish new material to scientific archaeology; and these results have a positive value, untouched by the fact that certain theories of their relation to the 'Iliad' are the figments of an eager imagination,—alluring but deluding phantoms, which, in the moment that hands are stretched forth to seize them, dissolve and vanish.

- ART. X.—1. *Return of Loans advanced for Relief of Trade to March, 1874.* Parliamentary Paper, 145. 1875.
2. *Report of the Select Committee on the Public Works Loan Acts Amendment, and Consolidation Bills, together with the Evidence.* 1875.
3. *The First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Annual Report of the Public Works Loan Board.* 1876–1880.
4. *Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Reports of the Local Government Board.* 1876–1878–1879.

WE do not propose on the present occasion to inflict upon our readers another dissertation on the Land Laws of Ireland, or to anticipate the discussions which will probably occupy the remainder of the Parliamentary Session. Still less do we desire to cast a retrospective glance on the questions which have checked the progress of reform and the action of the Government during the last three months. We conceive that we shall render a greater and a better service to the discussion of public affairs by calling the attention of our readers to a state of facts which nearly affects their own interests and touches the pocket of every ratepayer in the kingdom. We shall proceed to show that an amount of debt has been accumulated under the borrowing powers of boards, corporations, counties, and parishes which rivals the National Debt of smaller States, and adds no inconsiderable sum to our own public burdens, while it throws a formidable load on posterity to defray the extravagant and irresponsible expenditure of this generation.

Our National Debt amounts to 768,719,000*L.*, and no true statesman exists who does not desire its reduction. Some people there are, it is true, who see in the debt nothing but the evidence of wealth and prosperity. It may be that the only security for the debt lies in the prosperity of the nation, but a state of indebtedness for all that is not a desirable one. Some attempts are now and again made to reduce the weight of the huge incubus, and at times an appreciable diminution has through economy been effected. But of late years we have been fast creating another kind of national debt which is increasing at such an alarming rate that it is of the utmost importance that the facts relating to it should be made public and discussed. Very few appreciate the fact that already through local indebtedness a liability has been incurred which now amounts to not far short of a hundred and fifty millions sterling—equivalent to nearly one-fifth of the entire National Debt; and that every

year is adding to it at between eight and ten millions. True it is that while the greater portion of the National Debt is the heritage of costly and sometimes wanton and useless wars, this new debt has been incurred in the development of the arts of peace and for more or less laudable purposes to provide for the requirements of a higher civilization. An investigation of the matter however will indisputably show that, though much good undoubtedly has been done, millions have been utterly wasted, and that serious losses to the State have occurred, and are likely to occur in future. Undue facilities for borrowing have encouraged extravagance, while the power to lighten the burden attendant upon indebtedness by throwing a great part of the responsibility upon posterity has engendered something very like recklessness, and is calculated to have a most prejudicial effect upon the future interests of the country unless timely care is taken to limit it within reasonable bounds. Our knowledge of sanitary science is as yet far from perfect; many of the undertakings for which millions have been spent are really in the nature of experiments; and as it is impossible to foresee what changes future scientific discoveries will bring about, there is grave reason to fear that many things we now do will even within a near future be declared either inefficient or deleterious, and those who come after us will have a double burden to bear—the responsibility of paying off the debts now being incurred and the necessity of obtaining fresh capital to meet the wants of their own time.

Up to a recent period the amounts borrowed had been kept within reasonable limits, but during the last ten or fifteen years enormous sums have been raised under the operation of public and local Acts of Parliament passed within that period, at a rate which is becoming alarming. This indebtedness is created in two ways. Local authorities by local acts are authorised to raise loans in the open market; and for certain other purposes the Government acts as the lender through the medium of a Board created for that purpose. The following figures will show not merely the total amount of local indebtedness so far as can be ascertained; but it will also show how it has of late years been increasing by leaps and bounds; and no matter how we may wish to tone down the effect of these figures it cannot be denied that the matter is of serious import.

				£
For the year	1872-3	local indebtedness was	.	80,000,000
At the end of	1873-4	it stood at	.	85,500,000
"	"	1874-5	"	92,820,000
"	"	1875-6	"	99,654,218
"	"	1876-7	"	106,302,385
"	"	1877-8	"	114,683,002

While by this time there is very little doubt it falls but very little short of the sum of 150,000,000*l*.

If we analyse the securities upon which these loans have been raised; we find that for the year 1877-8 they stood thus :

	£
1. Chiefly secured on rates	84,973,321
2. On tolls, dues, and rents	27,864,681
3. On duties	1,845,000
Total	114,683,002

Of which the following is a more detailed summary :

	£
I. Rates chiefly :	
Poor Law	4,260,767
County	3,012,117
Borough	6,421,082
Highway	47,536
Metropolitan Local Management	2,247,995
Metropolitan Board of Works	11,898,706
Urban Sanitary	46,183,928
Rural Sanitary	451,680
Sewers Commission	57,298
Drainage and Embankment Commission	1,569,448
Burial Board	1,589,852
School Board	7,188,900*
Church	44,012
Total of loans secured on rates chiefly	84,973,321
II. Tolls, Dues, and Rents, chiefly :	
City of London	3,531,000
Turnpike Trustees	1,283,017
Bridge and Ferry Commissions	222,374
Market and Fair Commissions	93,854
Harbour Commissions	22,734,436
Total secured on tolls, dues, &c.	27,864,681
III. Duties exclusively :	
City of London Coal and Grain Duties	1,845,000
Grand total	114,683,002

* Since then later returns have been issued by the Committee of Council on Education, showing that up to Michaelmas 1879 the Public Works Loans Commissioners had advanced for educational purposes in England 9,598,554*l*., and in Wales 575,656*l*.; but that the sum actually due on the loans at that date was 9,222,930*l*. in England and 545,800*l*. in Wales. At the same time further loans had been recommended by the Department amounting, with the loans already made, to 11,260,716*l*.

The returns relating to local taxation and expenditure now published are not however very intelligible. They lack anything like a systematic clearness. Different authorities make their returns at different periods of the year; and in the great confusion of local areas—a matter the reform of which is really very urgent and should precede if possible any attempt at local government reform—there are no materials for comparing the expenses of local administration in urban and rural districts, or of discriminating how much of the indebtedness is urban and how much rural. So long as the confusion of local areas and their want of uniformity continues, we do not see how it is possible to obtain returns which would enable us at a glance to see the true position of this huge local indebtedness. If for all purposes of taxation the areas were one and distinct, and there was no overlapping of one authority into the area of another authority, the matter would be simple enough, and those who have to bear the burden would know the limit of their responsibility, which would not only be a convenient thing but a salutary restriction conducive to economy and preventive of much waste and extravagance.

Now the rateable property of the whole kingdom, although like the indebtedness it also steadily increases, is as yet considered to be so far in excess of the debt that there is no fear of anything like approaching insolvency. The following figures will show the total rateable value of property for several years:

	£
1869-70 the rateable value was	104,400,000
1871-2 „	109,000,000
1873-4 „	115,600,000
1874-5 „	119,079,000
1876 „	124,587,484
1877 „	127,948,380

And probably by this time the assessments will reach not much less than 150,000,000*l*.

With regard to the ratio of indebtedness, it may be taken that about one half represents the indebtedness of urban authorities including the metropolis, which, according to Mr. Selater Booth, represents substantial value: works which either of themselves are valuable property, or which add to the value of property; viz. sewers, street improvements, gas and water. When we come to further analyse the figures, we find that the metropolis with some six or seven of our large towns are the debtors for more than two thirds of the proportion due from urban authorities. Thus:

	£
The City of London is indebted to the amount of over .	5,000,000
The Metropolis outside the City	11,146,700
Birmingham	5,000,000
Liverpool	4,000,000
Manchester	4,450,000
Bradford	2,431,982
Leeds	3,613,530
Halifax	1,063,400
Huddersfield	1,084,602

In order to show the reckless way into which urban authorities have rushed into debt, and the serious burden imposed upon the ratepayers, it is only necessary to point out the relative proportions of indebtedness and assets. The rateable value of the whole urban sanitary districts of England and Wales stood thus under the following years, viz. :

	£
In 1874-5	41,154,717
„ 1875-6	44,781,473
„ 1876-7	46,150,826
„ 1877-8	48,375,889

thus showing the indebtedness to be something more than half as much again as the rateable value, a proportion sufficiently serious to demand the attention not merely of the localities implicated, but of statesmen.

The rural sanitary authorities have not rushed into debt as eagerly as the townspeople; their liability in respect of loans amounting only to the very moderate sum of 451,680*l.*; but the county authorities (chiefly for asylums and prisons) were indebted to the extent of 3,012,117*l.*, and the sum of four millions and a quarter has been borrowed on the security of the poor rates. Next however in importance after the debts incurred by the urban sanitary authorities under the provisions of the Public Health Act, the Artisans' Dwellings Act, &c., is the debt which has been incurred to carry out the provisions of the Education Acts, and secured on School Board rates, for the purpose of erecting and furnishing schools throughout the country. The sums advanced for this purpose amount already to something over 11,000,000*l.* sterling, and for some years to come further loans will undoubtedly have to be granted. The London School Board is the principal borrower under this head, their debt amounting to close upon 4,000,000*l.*

When we thus see that already local indebtedness stands at but a trifle short of 150,000,000*l.*, and that every year there is a very material increase, and the prospect for a long time of

still further increase, it is time that the matter should undergo the most thorough and serious consideration. It is not as if we had arrived at a period when we could contemplate the beginning of the end. We are in fact only at the beginning of a great system. Recent legislation, necessitating, or at all events encouraging, the expenditure of enormous amounts of money, has as yet scarcely begun its operation. It is probably true that, so far as the Education Acts are concerned, we have broken the back of the expenditure which the present generation will require; but the Sanitary Acts, the Artisans' Dwellings Act, and other legislative measures of that class, have 'hardly begun to develop themselves.' Indeed, to quote Sir Stafford Northcote, 'advances under the Sanitary Acts were becoming of such magnitude as to render it matter of serious national importance to consider where we were going and how far the system could be carried.' And although Sir Stafford's remarks principally applied to the transactions in which the Government were the lenders, they are equally applicable to the whole system of local loans, whether contracted in the open market or from the Public Works Loans Commissioners. It is curious that so much apathy should exist on a matter of such importance. There is scarcely any public opinion on the question. Each locality seems but to consider its own wants, and utterly in disregard of all sound principles of finance to launch into the most extravagant schemes. If the supervision of these loan transactions was conferred upon one department, some means of due restraint might be devised; but as it is, what with the facility of obtaining private acts of Parliament and other things, recklessness is encouraged, and an intolerable burden cast upon the ratepayers.

There is truth undoubtedly in the remarks of Mr. Rathbone in a discussion in Parliament when the total of these loans was only 90,000,000/.

'The rapid growth of that total may startle and alarm this House; but it will probably not give a moment's uneasiness to a single ratepayer. Why? Because in the existing condition of things the ratepayer does not and cannot know how much of the burden affects his own town or parish. If the ratepayer's district were the same for all purposes and were governed by one body, he would know the total debt of his district. He would jealously watch its growth. He would know the reason why for every increase; but as things are now the truth is concealed from him. For some purposes he is governed by the county justices, who have a debt for asylums and prisons; for other purposes he is governed by guardians, who have a debt for workhouses and perhaps for drains; for other purposes he is governed by a School Board, who have a debt for schools. So with highways, and perhaps

And this exclusively of the amounts required for the purchase of twenty-two gas and water undertakings, and the costs of the promotion of several local acts. For instance, to show that the above ascertained total of 20,481,838*l.* scarcely covers half of what was authorised to be borrowed within the past six years, it is only necessary to state that in 1875 the Corporation of Birmingham was empowered to borrow sufficient to purchase the waterworks of that borough, an amount not ascertained when the act was obtained, but which we now know cost nearly a million and a half sterling. Among other undertakings to be purchased for which the amounts to be borrowed had not been ascertained at the passing of the various acts were the Bolton Gas and Bury Waterworks, the Over Darwen Gas and Waterworks, the Nottingham Gas Company, Stockton and Middlesborough gas and water undertakings, &c.

When loans are authorised to be made under private acts of this character, this is not the only evil in connexion with the matter. The unreasonably long period given for repayment is a far graver evil. Sixty, seventy, ninety, and even a hundred years have been given by Parliament in these local acts to local authorities for paying off the debts authorised to be incurred. For instances of this undue length of time for liquidation it will suffice to state that, by the Birmingham Gas Act of 1875, a period of eighty-five years is given for repayment of the loan, while for the Waterworks Act of the same corporation ninety years is given to pay off the debt. One hundred years is actually given to the local authorities of Rochdale to pay off their debt, while one hundred and even one hundred and ten years are allowed under the Halifax Local Act. The corporation of Stockton has ninety years, and that of Leicester eighty. And these long periods are made still longer by the fact that in most of these local acts it is stipulated that a certain time shall elapse before the period of repayments shall commence. Five years, and in some cases even ten years, are thus added to the duration of the loans, which of course makes the burden less felt than ever by the persons who are the actual borrowers. In this way it becomes possible for posterity to be very severely handicapped. Where the works are of a permanent character it is, perhaps, only fair that posterity should have to bear a part of the burden, and it would be unjust to expect the present to sacrifice itself entirely for the future. Still, the interests of those who are to come after us should not be ignored, and it is the duty of the statesman to look forward as well as to watch

the present. In a discussion on the Public Loans Bill (1878) Sir Stafford Northcote very properly pointed out the evils of this system :

‘The effect of spreading the payment for works over a long period was this—that those who had planned and executed the work, and perhaps the generation who were most benefited by it, passed away whilst a very small proportion of the capital sum expended had been repaid ; and that the repayment of the great bulk of the capital was thrown upon the succeeding generation, which might perhaps have views of its own ; which might think, perhaps, that the action of its predecessors was not so good as should have been undertaken, and that the work, perhaps, was somewhat worn out ; and that at all events the new works which had developed themselves rendered it very desirable indeed that the community should get rid of these old burdens as much as possible, in order to raise money for other purposes.’

No one can doubt that our descendants will have their requirements as well as the present generation, and their burden will be very great indeed if, in addition to having to provide for their own clear wants, they will also have to provide for the repayment of moneys in the expenditure of which they had no part, and which, so far as they were concerned, need never have been expended. Besides, the very possibility of being able to lighten their burdens by laying on posterity the responsibility of paying off some of those debts, leads to much extravagance in the present. It is a very pleasant thing to be able to have the handling and disposal of vast sums of money with the knowledge that you will only be required to refund a portion of it ; and that others will have to bear the burden without any of the pleasure or the pain attendant upon the expending. It gives great power and influence to the promoters of these loans. It enables them, by affording employment to vast numbers of workmen with money thus borrowed on such easy terms, to pose as local benefactors ; and so long as social, and even political influence can thus cheaply be purchased, astute and ambitious men will be eager to induce localities to enter upon a course of extravagance which in the long run may seriously affect the prosperity of these localities.

Except in so far as the facilities offered to borrow money in this way lead undoubtedly to considerable extravagance and needless waste of money, and that the system which permits authorities to lighten their burdens by transmitting liability to posterity is, in many instances, most unjust,—where the local authorities take their securities to the open market and borrow

on the best terms they can, the matter is one which concerns the borrowers and lenders themselves rather than the nation at large, although, undoubtedly, a state of heavy local indebtedness may hereafter have disastrous effects, affecting the whole country. But when the Government itself becomes the lender of vast sums, it becomes at once a national concern to see that all possible security shall be taken against losses, and that the system to be pursued shall at least be conducted on sound business principles.

The system of loans by the Treasury appears to date from the year 1792. The want of money was very much felt at that time—credit was low, and trade and commerce were paralysed. To relieve this commercial distress, and to give the means of employment to those who wanted it, several acts were passed between that date and 1817. By the 33 Geo. III., over two millions were advanced ‘for the assistance of such persons as may be desirous of obtaining the same.’ Six years later the sum of 269,000*l.* was lent ‘for the relief of merchants trading between Liverpool and Lancaster,’ and by the 51 Geo. III. 1,338,000*l.* was advanced ‘for the relief of commercial credit.’ Every farthing was afterwards repaid. Large sums were also advanced by way of West India relief. Towards ‘public works’ about the same period, over a million and a quarter was advanced for the improvement of the port of London and the construction of the West India Docks, and over a quarter of a million was expended on the erection of the Menai and Conway bridges. Of these earlier loans for English public works, with the exception of the last named, the debt and interest has all been paid; while as to the latter, a sum nearly sufficient to cover the principal has been obtained from tolls, &c., so that there is only the loss of interest. For Scotland the sum of 265,000*l.* was lent for the improvement of the harbour and docks of Leith. In respect of this loan the sum of 198,502*l.* only was ever received towards liquidating both principal and interest, and a loss of no less than 178,374*l.* was sustained, which was wiped off by a recent Act of Parliament. All these loans were granted by the Treasury on the authority of specific Acts of Parliament.

It was not until the year 1817 that the department of the public service—the Public Works Loan Commission—was created by the statute 57 Geo. III. c. 34. At that time, soon after the conclusion of the European war, great difficulty was felt in obtaining loans of capital for the execution

of many works of public utility, and large numbers of the working classes were out of employment. The act, after reciting that, under those circumstances, great advantages would arise from affording employment to the labouring classes by the advance of Exchequer bills and money out of the Consolidated Fund for carrying on works of a public nature, under the authority of Parliament, or for the encouragement of fisheries, collieries, or mines, or for the employment of the poor, authorised the advance for such purposes of 1,750,000*l.* and appointed twenty-one commissioners for the lending of the money on due security—the employment of the labouring classes to be the principal object to be considered. Between that date and 1842 several other acts were passed, placing further sums at the disposal of the Commissioners for Loans, and authorising advances to be made for the following among other purposes:—drainage, roads, railroads, harbours, gaols, union workhouses in Ireland, and public works in the Isle of Man. Altogether, from 1817 to 1842, there were issued in Exchequer bills for the above purposes various sums which, in the aggregate, amounted to 7,650,000*l.*

In 1842 the further issue of Exchequer bills was stopped, and by an act passed in that year (5 Vict. Sess. 2, c. 9) provision was made that for the purpose of any future loans during the next five years, the sum of 360,000*l.* a year out of the Consolidated Fund should be at the disposal of the Loan Commissioners in quarterly sums of 90,000*l.* to make advances for the same objects as before, and also for county and town halls and lunatic asylums. At the expiration of the five years, and afterwards at the expiration of every five years, the act was renewed, until by the 29 and 30 Vict. cc. 72 and 73, it was enacted that such issues should be made until Parliament should otherwise determine. During this period also, in addition to the powers contained in these statutes, many public and private acts were passed, authorising the Commissioners to lend money for public works upon the securities set forth in such acts. Of the public Acts of Parliament which devolved this duty upon the Commissioners, the following were amongst the most important:—The Lunatic Asylums Act; the Poor Law Amendment Acts, authorising loans to be made for building workhouses, &c.; the Burials Act; the Baths and Washhouses Act; the Public Libraries Acts; the Merchant Shipping Acts, 1854 and 1855, for loans to construct lighthouses at home and in the colonies; the Sewage Utilization Act, and the earlier Public Health and Local Government Acts, authorising loans

for the drainage and water supply of towns and other improvements. During the same period many special Acts of Parliament were passed granting loans for special purposes upon special conditions. Two of these authorised the loan of 90,000*l.* for the improvements of the roads between London and Holyhead. Another authorised loans at four per cent. for repairing and building churches and enlarging colleges. A third authorised the issue of 400,000*l.* for improvements at Charing Cross and in the Strand, on the security of houses, &c. By another a loan of 120,000*l.* for the construction of the Ulster Canal was sanctioned. The 3 and 4 Will. IV. c. 121, authorised the issue of 270,000*l.* in Exchequer bills for the completion of the Thames Tunnel—a work then deemed of great national importance. At this day it is difficult to understand how this work could be considered of national importance, and the loan, which turned out very badly, has been much ridiculed. In 1844 the sum of 215,241*l.* was advanced to redeem the debts on the turnpike roads in South Wales, the advance being secured by annuities. The whole loan has now been liquidated. Between 1847 and 1853, 200,000*l.* (under the 9 and 10 Vict. cc. 38 and 83) was advanced for the formation of a royal park at Battersea, upon the security of lands purchased for the purposes of the Act, some of which would not be required for the park. The loan has only been partially repaid, and the loss upon this transaction is very considerable. At the same time the Chelsea Bridge was being erected with the aid of 80,000*l.* advanced to the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, and a recent Act of Parliament was required to square off this debt, a great part of which remained irrecoverable. By the 12 and 13 Vict. c. 62, the sum of half a million sterling was advanced to the Midland Great Western Railway Company of Ireland to extend their line from Athlone to Galway. During the cotton famine 1,850,000*l.* was authorised to be advanced for loans to enable local authorities in Lancashire, Cheshire, and Derbyshire to execute works of public utility and sanitary improvements with a view to the employment of such of the labouring and manufacturing classes as were unable to find work owing to the closing of mills and factories. The sum actually advanced under this was 1,759,015*l.* Thirty years is the term allowed for repayment of this loan. Up to this time the instalments are regularly paid, but nearly half of the loan is still outstanding. The outbreak of the cattle plague in 1865–6 necessitating the slaughter of infected cattle, it was enacted that the sum of 500,000*l.* should be advanced out of the Consolidated Fund for loans to local authorities to enable

them to carry out the provisions of the prevention acts and to compensate those whose cattle had to be destroyed. Only 290,000*l.* however was advanced for this purpose, at 3½ per cent. interest, repayable in thirty-five years. With regard to these special acts, the Public Works Loans Commissioners were simply the medium for granting the loans, and they had no discretion in the matter. It is with regard to loans advanced under these circumstances, as we shall hereafter see, that losses to any serious extent have been sustained.

In 1861 a very important act was passed (the Harbours and Passing Tolls Act), enabling harbour authorities, with the sanction of the Board of Trade, to borrow through the Public Works Loans Commissioners money for constructing and improving and lighting any public harbours at 3½ per cent., where the sum is under 100,000*l.*, and above that at such interest not exceeding 5 per cent. as the Commissioners shall determine. Under this Act, although the Commissioners have endeavoured to narrow its operation by limiting it to harbours of refuge, nearly two millions and a half have been advanced. Some considerable arrears are due in respect of instalments under this head, and only last year an Act of Parliament was passed authorising the acceptance of 20,000*l.* in liquidation of a sum of 53,992*l.* balance of a loan of 58,200*l.* advanced under the Harbours Act of 1861 to the Isle of Man Harbour Commissioners in respect of the harbour at Port Erin there. . And the Commissioners in their last report ask for power to require additional security for loans to be hereafter made under that Act.

It is, however, under more recent acts, and notably the Public Health and Sanitary Acts, 1872–1875, and the Education Acts, that the loans advanced through the instrumentality of the Commissioners have reached a total which has been viewed with no little apprehension, and which is annually being increased by millions.

The Public Health Act, 1872, authorised the Commissioners, on the recommendation of the Local Government Board, to make any loan to any sanitary authority, pursuant to the powers of borrowing under the Sanitary Act, whether for works already executed or yet to be executed, such loans to be repayable within a period not exceeding thirty or fifty years respectively, at 3½ per cent. interest, or such other rates as the Treasury should think requisite, to save the Exchequer from loss. This power was repeated in the Consolidation Act of 1875, the limit for repayment being fixed within fifty years; and power was therein given to the Commissioners, in case

of loans for sanitary purposes made before 1872, to reduce the interest thereon to not less than $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Hitherto, however, the Commissioners have declined to vary the rate of interest. And the Commissioners have further confined the grant of loans for 'sanitary purposes' to water supply, sewerage, disposal of sewage, and the providing of hospitals—in other words, they will grant loans only for 'works strictly conducive to public health.' A much wider interpretation of the words 'sanitary purposes' and 'sanitary acts' might have been adopted; but the Commissioners have wisely adhered to the narrower meaning. Attempts were made to include slaughterhouses within the definition, but the Public Works Loan Board declined a loan on the ground that they were works which might be made profitable. The Board, however, later on acceded to an application for loans for baths and washhouses, on the representation of the Local Government Board, that the charges which the local authorities are empowered to make for the use of these establishments are limited to small sums which would not render them remunerative. The loans granted under the Sanitary Acts and the Public Health Acts now amount to the sum of nearly eight millions sterling raised by direct Government loans, and entirely irrespective of the cost of water supply in the metropolis and the larger towns where the supply is either made by private companies or purchased and carried on by the local authorities by means of loans obtained in the open market.

The Elementary Education Acts, however, have been the cause of the largest indebtedness to the State. By the Act of 1870, school boards were authorised to borrow, and the Commissioners to lend, such sums of money as should, on the recommendation of the Education Department, be required for the purpose of erecting schools and carrying into effect the provisions of the Act on the security of the school fund or local rate thereby authorised, such loans to be repayable within fifty years. The rate of interest on all the loans granted under this Act is $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and as regards the time for repayment the Board has acted upon the recommendations of the Education Department. Some of the loans are repayable within ten years, others within twenty-one, twenty-five, and thirty; but by far the largest number have been allowed the full term of fifty years for repayment. The total amount lent up to this time for this purpose exceeds eleven millions.

Then again in 1875 the Artisans' Dwellings Act was passed to enable local authorities to pull down unhealthy rookeries,

and to build healthy homes for the working classes. For this purpose the local authorities were empowered to borrow, and the Commissioners to lend, money for such town improvements where the scheme had received the sanction of a provisional order of the Local Government Board. The amount borrowed under the Act—which is in no way connected with the Labourers' Dwellings Act of 1865, and the Artisans' Dwellings Act of 1868, under both of which loans have been granted to private companies—is at present nearly two millions sterling, of which Birmingham alone in 1877–78 borrowed the large sum of one million pounds, and a further half-million in 1878–9. Liverpool and Wolverhampton, Cardiff and Swansea, are among the principal borrowers next after Birmingham, but in no instance has the loan exceeded 50,000*l.* Great schemes under the Act are contemplated, and some of them have been commenced, in London, which, so far as at present can be ascertained, have involved truly enormous losses upon the unfortunate ratepayers; but as the Metropolitan Board of Works borrows in the open market, and the City of London upon the security of its own stock, the transactions under the Act, so far as concerns the Public Works Loan Board, have not been very numerous, nor, except in the case of Birmingham, of large amount.

The total amount advanced by the Public Works Loan Commissioners from the date they were originally appointed until March 31, 1880, was 44,743,191*l.* 6*s.* 7*d.* Of this 3,347,278*l.* 9*s.* 9*d.* stands to the credit of loan services now closed. Among the objects for which the closed loans were made were colleges, collieries and mines, compensation for damage during riots, emigration, fisheries, railways, relief of parishes, South Wales turnpike trusts, Thames Tunnel, and waterworks; and in Ireland, law courts, Ulster Canal, roads, and union workhouses. The chief items were: 1,422,680*l.* for Irish workhouses; 490,000*l.* for railways in England; 303,700*l.* for collieries and mines; and 250,500*l.* for the Thames Tunnel. The losses on these claims amount to an astounding figure—no less than 1,732,630*l.* has had to be remitted; viz. in respect of Irish workhouses, 1,370,534*l.*; the Ulster Canal, 120,000*l.*; the Thames Tunnel, 150,500*l.*, &c.

The following shows the exact amounts advanced on current and unclosed loan services up to the end of March 1880 :

Great Britain.

	£	s.	d.
Artisans and Labourers Dwellings Improvement (England) .	1,414,979	0	0
Artisans and Labourers Dwellings Improvement (Scotland) .	115,000	0	0
Baths and Washhouses	81,846	0	0
Bridges and Ferries	352,290	0	0
Burial Boards	881,692	0	0
Canals, Rivers, and Drainage	1,735,600	0	0
Cattle Diseases Prevention Act, 1866	290,000	0	0
Churches and Parochial Chapels	440,218	0	0
Harbours, Docks, and Piers	779,500	0	0
Improvement of Cities and Towns, and Battersea Park	917,100	0	0
Labouring Classes Dwellings Act, 1866-67	394,741	0	0
Law Courts, Gaols, and other Public Buildings	826,436	0	0
Local Boards, &c.	1,195,633	0	0
Lunatic Asylums	412,856	0	0
Police Commissioners, Scotland	33,755	0	0
Portpatrick Railway Company	111,141	0	0
Prisons, England	57,882	0	0
Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) Act, 1863-64	1,759,015	0	0
Roads	666,270	0	0
Sanitary Loans (England)	5,492,400	0	0
Sanitary Loans (Scotland)	507,763	0	0
School Boards (England)	10,615,919	0	0
School Boards (Scotland)	2,368,112	0	0
Workhouses	3,945,642	0	0

Ireland.

Belfast and County Down Railway Company	164,804	7	9
Burial Boards	18,678	0	0
Harbours	40,850	0	0
Railways	2,686,550	0	0
Railway Companies (Ireland) Temporary Advances Act, 1866	159,356	0	0
Sewage Utilisation	11,035	0	0
Waterworks	479,000	0	0
Workhouse	2,000	0	0

Harbours and Passing Tolls, &c., Act, 1861 2,407,849 9 1

In respect of these loans many bad debts have been incurred, and although barely one third of the whole amount has become due, the Treasury or Parliament have been called upon to remit various large sums. We have already referred to the loss sustained with regard to the port of Erin in the Isle of Man. 43,279*l.* had to be remitted in respect of loans advanced for canals; 15,088*l.* in respect of harbours; 59,086*l.* in respect of roads; 24,000*l.* in respect of railways; and the losses in respect of Leith Harbour, Battersea Park, and the Thames Tunnel are much larger.

The position of the loan transactions of the Public Works Loan Commissioners at the close of March last therefore stood thus. Out of a total closed account of 3,347,278*l.* not quite one half was actually paid, and the balance had to be wiped off as a bad debt and irrecoverable. Out of our unclosed loans account of 40,456,865*l.* only 15,427,515*l.* had been repaid by way of principal, and there was outstanding in respect of

principal 25,498,231*l.* irrespective of a sum of 255,000*l.* in arrear, and some of which would most unquestionably never be recovered, and a sum of 273,120*l.* by way of interest. The interest payable on the outstanding loans may be thus classified :

<i>£</i>		
20,000	at 3	per cent. per annum.
1,597,807	at $3\frac{1}{4}$	" "
19,295,827	at $3\frac{1}{2}$	" "
568,421	at $3\frac{3}{4}$	" "
3,164,504	at 4	" "
82,898	at $4\frac{1}{4}$	" "
1,023,903	at 5	" "

And the terms given for the repayment of these sums vary between twenty and fifty years.

This system of State loans is open to grave objections. It can only be justified on the grounds of absolute public necessity. But loans have been granted for purposes which it is impossible to consider as of any national or public importance. In all these dealings the Government assumes the character of a money lender, with this difference between it and ordinary money lenders, that it makes advances for laudable purposes enough it is true, but often upon inadequate security and upon terms which involve no inconsiderable risk. Mr. Hubbard, who for a quarter of a century acted as chairman of the Board of Public Works Loan Commissioners—much to the advantage of the State, as has been amply testified by all those who have had to consider the work of the Commissioners—expresses himself very strongly against the desirability of converting the Board of Commissioners into a financial department of the State for lending money for all sorts of works. ‘The State,’ he says, in his examination by the Select Committee in 1875, ‘has no business to be a money-lender at all. ‘It is only from exceptional necessity that the existence and ‘action of such a Board as that can be tolerated ;’ and, further, in answer to an interrogatory addressed to him on the same occasion, he said :

‘If the purpose of the Public Works Loans Commissioners was to enable borrowing authorities to obtain money at lower terms than they could in the open market, I should consider that our existence was a public disaster. I conceive that it is only under special circumstances that the intervention of such a Board as the Public Works Loans Commissioners should be brought into action, and then that the purposes should be such as approve themselves as public purposes, as instanced in the Harbour and Passing Tolls Act, the Cotton Famine, the Cattle Plague, and perhaps the Education Act.’

With this view we are strongly inclined to agree, and to consider, therefore, that, except in the case of some great public necessity, the Government should not act as money lenders. Mr. Hubbard then succinctly stated the objections to this system of public loans. The Government, he said, ought not to interfere in a matter of lending money at all; they are not capitalists, they have no surplus; on the contrary, they are largely in debt and can never lend unless they begin by borrowing; therefore it is not their office, and the only circumstance which can in the slightest degree justify their intervention is the occurrence of some great public necessity which has to be dealt with immediately, and dealt with upon terms which would make it difficult or impossible for those who are to be assisted to obtain aid in a pecuniary sense, even as a loan, from the general money market.

With a view to encourage local authorities to go to the open market to raise loans, the Local Loans Act of 1875 was passed, which enabled local authorities to obtain loans on various kinds of securities thereby authorised. These securities are divided into four classes, viz. 1, nominal debentures; 2, debentures payable to bearer; 3, terminable annuities—principal and interest to be discharged by annual instalments; and 4, in certain cases, debenture stock. Provision was made for the official sanction of such loans by the Local Government Board, which made them indisputable, and, with certain limitations, trustees were enabled to invest trust funds in these local securities. This Act, however, has not to any great extent been used by the borrowing authorities. In the first year only 3,000*l.* was borrowed under it, and altogether not quite half a million has been raised under its provisions. The reason is very clear. It is easier to borrow from the Public Works Loans Commissioners. They do not require such a strictly good security as outsiders. Their terms are cheaper, and they are not quite so stern and so exacting as ordinary money lenders in cases of default. And the borrowers know that if the security should hereafter fail, or the burden of repayment become too great, they will be able to appeal to the Government to relieve them with more success than to private lenders. Thus many a wild scheme has been effected which would never have been done but for Government loans. In this there is no little danger of the imperial revenues being taxed to make up for local folly and extravagance. It was quite obvious, as Sir Stafford Northcote remarked, that

the relations between a large community borrowing money from the State—the relations between debtor and creditor in that case—were very different from the relations between a borrowing community and a bank or private capitalist who had advanced the money. The latter would say, ‘You are bound to pay us this debt which you have contracted, and you have shown us no reason whatever why we should remit a portion of it to you.’ On the other hand, when the parties concerned were a great city and the State, the representatives of the city had always a temptation to come to the State and say, ‘This was money expended under your encouragement a certain number of years ago. We were stimulated to do these things, and we laid out—or our ancestors laid out—a great deal of money in great haste. The burden falls upon us. We find these works do not suit the present day. You are very properly calling upon us to execute other works, and will you help us to do that by taking off, at all events, a part of the debt which we contracted for those other public purposes, and which, therefore, you are quite justified in taking off?’ Well, that was a danger which might be very large and which must not be put out of sight. To this Mr. Chamberlain, who stands forth as the champion of the borrowers and the advocate of these Government loans, replied that it was quite possible that years hence pressure might be brought to bear by a particular locality to secure a remission of loans obtained from the Exchequer, but he contended that it appeared to him impossible that Parliament should ever accede to such a request for the reason that the interest of every locality will be against the particular locality claiming such remission. And this in the face of the patent fact, that while such debts were remissible by a Treasury warrant, warrants of remission were constantly granted to applicants, and since the Legislature thought fit to put an end to such power in the Treasury, scarcely a year has passed in which bills have not been brought in and enacted for the purpose of wiping off bad debts, or debts difficult of recovery. It is perfectly true that it is against the interest of the country at large that Parliament should thus cast upon the imperial revenues the burden of ill-secured debts, but it has been done and is being constantly done, thus benefiting one or more localities at the expense of the entire community.

Many of these advances were made for truly public purposes, but on security which could scarcely be considered adequate: certainly upon security such as would not have been recognised in open market. It is now said that these

loans were not considered as loans, and that it is not right to consider them as loans at all, but that they were more in the nature of grants or gifts. Of these kind of advances many were never repaid, and the Treasury from time to time exercised its power of wiping off such bad debts by remission. This they did by means of a Treasury warrant, without consulting Parliament in any shape or form. Of course, when a bad debt has clearly been incurred and there is no prospect of its being paid off, it can answer no good purpose to retain it on the books. Still, this mode of remitting such debts by the secret method of a Treasury warrant—the Treasury being, perhaps, susceptible to influences which would not affect Parliament—was a very objectionable exercise of power, whereas, if the matter was left to the decision of Parliament, some care, at all events, would be taken not unduly to burden the country with the debt of a mere locality which alone had been benefited by the loan, and the very discussion of such a matter would act as a public warning to the Loan Commissioners, and such departments of the State as had anything to do with the granting of loans, to exercise greater caution and to see that the best possible security against loss should be taken. One of the most notable instances of this kind of remission by means of a Treasury letter or warrant was the remission of a sum of 150,500*l.*, the balance of a loan of 250,000*l.* granted to aid the construction of that gigantic piece of folly, the Thames Tunnel. While as to the cancellation of debts by statutes we need only refer to two recent acts. By the 40 and 41 Vict. c. 32 certain debts and balances of debts deemed to be irrecoverable, amounting in the aggregate in respect of principal alone to the sum of 460,611*l.* 10*s.* 5*d.* were extinguished and wiped off. A note to the statute states that, in addition to this sum outstanding on account of principal, it is reputed that the amount of *simple* interest unpaid in respect of such loans is not less than half a million sterling, all of which had to be sacrificed. Out of this, however, should be deducted the sum of 12,600*l.* balance of principal advanced for the purchase of the site of the Bankruptcy Court in Basinghall Street, and any interest in respect of it, as under the operation of various statutes the debt has virtually, although not in form, been repaid. Noticeable among the debts which had thus to be remitted may be named—the Crinan Canal debt of 74,000*l.*, in respect of which, although the money was lent to a private adventure company (in 1799), not one farthing had ever been repaid on account of either principal or interest; the Glasgow and Carlisle Roads debt of 47,890*l.* granted in

1816 on the security of surplus of the tolls and duties after payment of interest to private creditors. The revenues were not enough to pay interest to the private creditors. The Queensferry (Frith of Forth) debt of 10,000*l.* also lent on the security of tolls and duties. Nothing was ever received in respect of it, and the undertaking was in 1867 sold for 4,500*l.* which was swallowed up by private creditors who had a preferential claim thereto. The other debts remitted were 10,000*l.* in respect of the Fife and Midlothian Ferries, 70,000*l.* in respect of Canadian Canals, and 236,000*l.* lent to the New Zealand Company, which, perhaps, ought to be considered as cancelled by the surrender of the company's charters to the Government.

Again, by the 42 and 43 Vict. c. 35 debts amounting in respect of principal outstanding to 115,596*l.* 17*s.* 6*d.* on loans made by the Exchequer Commissioners, or the Public Works Loans Commissioners; and other debts amounting to 31,931*l.* 10*s.* 4*d.* irrespective of interest on loans made by the Works Loans Commissioners in Ireland, were finally wiped out as being utterly irrecoverable. Of the 115,596*l.* so remitted 24,671*l.* was the balance of a loan of 60,000*l.* advanced in 1868-70 for the construction of the Waterford, New Ross and Wexford Railway, and 11,400*l.*, the balance of a loan of 12,000*l.* in 1827, for making a road from Cork to Ballyhooley, only one instalment of which was ever paid. The other debts remitted comprised in the said sum of 115,596*l.* were in respect of loans made for the Saltash Floating Bridge, the Tay Ferries, Norwich and Lowestoft Navigation (43,279*l.*), some 4,000*l.* for church-building at several places, some 14,000*l.* for certain roads, 4,691*l.* for the Heckbridge and Wentbridge Railway, and 6,000*l.* in respect of a loan for the improvement of Courtown Harbour. In the face of such recent remissions by Act of Parliament, it is idle therefore for Mr. Chamberlain to contend that Parliament will not in the future accede to wipe off local loans and to throw the burden of local debts upon the public revenues.

Doubtless it will be said that we are never likely to repeat such a mistake as that which was made in the matter of the Thames Tunnel. It is only natural to think we are far wiser than those who have gone before us. We certainly learn experience from the past, and may be expected to avoid such errors as were committed in former years. But it would be presumptuous to predict that no mistakes will be committed in the future. Grievous blunders have been committed involving serious losses to the State and heavy burdens upon districts that can ill bear the weights thereof. Or, as one speaker very forcibly put it,

‘ Much of the money had been wasted ; millions had been spent ‘ in pouring the filth of towns into the rivers—millions had now ‘ to be spent in getting it out again.’ It would be most satisfactory, certainly, if we could by any possibility be assured that such a thing will not happen in the future. But, as we have already hinted, sanitary science is imperfect and progressive. Changes and alterations will become necessary, the old or the imperfect will have to be replaced by newer inventions, and fresh expenditure will have to be incurred before the old liability has been paid off. And there is no doubt that the State will frequently be called upon to relieve localities of burdens which they find difficult to bear.

That this system of Government loans has already resulted in serious losses to the Exchequer is evident to the most cursory student of the subject. How much has thus been lost Sir Stafford Northcote in one of his most recent speeches on the subject enables us to form some idea of.

‘ Since 1792,’ he said, ‘ the State had been a lender of 85,883,000*l.*, and assuming all debts outstanding were good debts, they would get back 89,900,000*l.*— that was to say, they would receive back all the principal advanced and the sum of 4,000,000*l.* as representing interest. It was difficult to say how much that interest represented ; but careful calculations had been made, and the result which they arrived at was that it probably represented something equivalent to 12*s.* per cent. on all the money that had been advanced. If therefore the State had been paying, as they certainly had, a good deal more than 3*l.* per cent., and had not received back more than 12*s.* per cent., it could not be said that these transactions had been an unmixed benefit to the State.’

Here at any rate, in a perfectly clear statement, and one made after careful enquiry and calculation, it is demonstrated that this loan system of Government has resulted in a very serious loss ; and that the country at large has had to bear the loss of this, while only a few localities have derived any benefit from the loans. Now, as the Public Works Loans Commissioners have been in existence since 1817, it will probably be at once assumed that the Commissioners have been very lax in their mode of conducting business, by lending on inadequate securities. But it is only due to them to say that, so far as regards the loans for which the Commissioners are really responsible, every care has been taken to enquire into the character of the security, and the fact is that, with but a few exceptions, the loans granted by them have been made on tolerably ample security ; but very often pressure was brought to bear upon them by the Treasury and other departments of the State ; they became merely the instruments of the Treasury,

and it is generally with regard to such loans that 'bad debts' have been incurred. Mr. Hubbard, when examined by the Select Committee, stated that in such cases the Commissioners did not feel that they were called upon to make the close enquiry and to impose the conditions which, as in the case of ordinary, they did when left to exercise their own discretion; and in fact they were inclined to consider loans when so made 'under pressure' to be rather in the nature of a subsidy or gift than of a loan in the ordinary acceptation of the word. So that there must be a distinction made between loans granted at the instance of Parliament and the Treasury and those made by the Commissioners themselves. And it is only fair to admit there is truth and force in the comment made by Mr. Chamberlain on the statement of Sir Stafford which we have already quoted.

'The fact was,' he said, 'that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in order to show his average interest at 12s. per cent., had included the whole of the losses made in the office of the Commissioners. The total of those losses was 2,095,000*l.* Of that sum 1,078,000*l.* was lost in Ireland in loans which were really of the nature of a gift which was made to the poor country by the rich country, and the repayment of which was never seriously anticipated. It included also office expenses and the loss by a fraudulent clerk, together amounting to 55,000*l.*; and then there were the losses on advances made upon the security of undertakings [such as railways, harbours, and roads], 442,000*l.*'

Among the losses thus occasioned we may mention 100,000*l.* in respect of the construction of the Thames Tunnel, and 200,000*l.* in respect of Battersea Park—the former a loan which was of so absurd a nature that it is difficult to understand how it was ever made, and the latter a matter which the locality benefited ought to have borne the burden of.

The Commissioners are clearly therefore not responsible for these losses; and indeed perhaps it is not quite fair to treat the Irish workhouses grant as a loss at all. But even with regard to the loans for the granting of which the Commissioners are clearly answerable there has been some loss, notwithstanding they have exercised the utmost care. Still the fact is that 'in the sixty-two years the sum issued from the Exchequer to the Public Works Loans Commissioners was 41,694,000*l.* The whole of the money was to pay 3½ per cent., and they ought to have received into the Exchequer 10,937,000*l.*, but they had actually received only 9,362,000*l.* or 2*l.* 15s. per cent., and this notwithstanding that during a great part of the time the loans had been made not at the low rate of 3½ per cent., but that 4

‘and even 5 per cent. interest had in some cases been charged.’ But here again it is only fair to state that the losses have not occurred to any great degree upon loans granted on the security of rates. Mr. Chamberlain asserted—and his statement was not contradicted—that during the whole period that the loan transactions had been going on no serious losses had been sustained in connexion with loans which had been made on the security of the rates. That of course, so far, is somewhat reassuring; but considering that of the moneys lent by the Commissioners there is still due, in respect of principal alone, over twenty-five millions, it is impossible to foretell how much of all this will turn out bad, and it would be dangerous to affirm until all such loans are collected that no losses will be sustained. Judging from the past, we may safely surmise that many bad debts will turn out to have been contracted, the losses from which will of necessity fall upon the community at large.

Now, if these loans are to be continued—if it is convenient and desirable that local authorities should come to the Treasury rather than go to the open market to borrow money—it is most essential that the Treasury shall charge such a rate of interest at least as will protect it from loss. It is not fair that the inhabitants of a locality in the wilds of Wales or the hills of Cumberland should have to pay for the convenience and benefit of Birmingham or any other large town without receiving some reciprocal advantage. We are assured, and we have sufficiently shown, that, notwithstanding the utmost vigilance and care on the part of the Loans Commissioners, great losses have been incurred, and if one thing has been clearly proved it is that $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest is not enough to save the Exchequer from loss, or, in other words, to cover the advances, to bear the official expenses, and to allow for bad debts. It is impossible to devise means to prevent bad debts from being incurred. Some such results must inevitably occur in any system of money-lending. And the risk is greater in lending money which is not to be paid off for forty or fifty years. It is impossible to foresee what may happen within so long a period. Flourishing towns, great centres of industry, have of late years risen up with marvellous rapidity in several parts of the country. The prosperity, and even existence, of these towns depend on the chances of perhaps one particular industry. But who can say how long that industry will last under present conditions, or what changes may take place in half a century? It is in those

swiftly growing centres that loans for improvements are mostly sought after. Suppose the case, for instance, of a town of recent growth, the whole prosperity of which rested upon the continuance of a mine in the neighbourhood, or of some industry like tin works. It is not impossible that long before fifty years the mine might have become exhausted or the works become unproductive. Loans advanced to such a town would stand but a poor chance of liquidation after its prosperity had waned. For these reasons therefore it is necessary that the Commissioners should be authorised to charge a safe rate of interest in respect of such loans, and to stipulate for the repayment of principal and interest within a limited period.

But so long as the incidence of taxation remains as it is, so long as the burden really falls upon the occupiers and the owners bear no part of it, there is, we frankly admit, some reason against requiring the repayment of these loans which are expended for permanent improvement of property to be made within short periods. The injustice of this was very temperately stated by Mr. Fawcett in a discussion in the House upon the Public Works Loans Bill (1875).

‘What was the present position of the question of local taxation? The great increase in the local taxation had been caused chiefly by perpetually calling new rates into existence, and he would prove how peculiarly unjust was the system of throwing every shilling of the capital and interest of loans for public works upon occupiers and not upon owners. He would take the Artisans’ Dwellings Bill as an illustration of his proposition. The Home Secretary [Mr. Cross] said that although the Bill would in the first instance involve a considerable charge in order to carry it into execution, yet the ratepayers would ultimately be remunerated and compensated even in a pecuniary sense. Admitting that statement to be truly accurate, what did it amount to? Supposing 600,000*l.* were required to be raised in order to provide dwellings for the working classes, it must be borrowed on the principle that the whole of the money, principal and interest, should be repaid in twenty-one years. To do that it would be necessary to impose a shilling rate, the result being that at the end of that term the municipality would, according to the supposition of the Home Secretary, find itself in possession of a property worth 800,000*l.* But every shilling of the additional rate would have been paid by the occupiers, while not a farthing would have been contributed by the owners of the buildings, or by the owners of the land on which they stood. If then the occupiers had given to the municipality a property worth 800,000*l.*, the rates would be reduced; if the rates were reduced rents would be raised; and it came to this—that the occupier of a house would be rated in order to enable the owner ultimately to put

the money into his own pocket in the form of increased rent. It was difficult to imagine anything which involved a greater infringement of the principles of financial justice. There could be no doubt that if, for the sake of effecting any improvement, money was borrowed and a new rate imposed to pay the principal and interest of the loan, every shilling of the rate would be paid by the occupiers as distinguished from the owners of farms, houses, and business premises.'

This injustice, for such it is, could be remedied to a certain extent if new charges were borne partly by the owner and partly by the occupier, for, at all events in cases of leases which extended over the period of repayment, it would be possible for an owner by increase of rent to recoup himself of so much of the liability as fell to his share. The unpopularity of the school rate in England, which becomes burdensome because provision has to be made for repayment out of it of moneys borrowed by way of loan for the erection of schools, is no doubt attributable to a considerable extent to the fact that the burden is one borne exclusively by occupiers. Now, in Scotland, although the school board rate there is often heavier than it is in England, it is not nearly so unpopular, because there the owner has to bear half of the impost, as he has also to pay half of the poor rate. A similar arrangement exists in Ireland as regards the poor rate—including the sanitary rate—and as regards the rate to provide for the salaries of the teachers in the national schools. When Sir Stafford Northcote came to discuss this point his reply was very weak, for he had to admit that there was great danger in making the repayment fall within too short a time, as it would then fall too heavily on the occupier; while, on the other hand, he contended if the time were made too short burdens might be thrown on the proprietor without his consent, and from which he would never derive any benefit. But we fail to conceive of any case where the proprietor would never derive any benefit unless it were possible that the improvement itself were to co-exist with the tenant's occupation, and have vanished away at the end of the tenancy. Nor is it any greater hardship for the proprietor to have burdens thrust upon him without his consent than it is for the occupier. And, although theoretically the occupier has the management of his own local affairs, and elects his representatives at the local boards, it is absurd to suggest that his consent is required before any scheme of improvement is carried into effect. It is all very well to say that if the occupier's tenure were equal to the duration of the improvement, he enjoyed the benefit of it and paid back the loan; that if his tenure

were less the charge remained on the land, and the incoming occupier would have to pay it, and of course arranged his rent accordingly, 'so that the matter was self-acting if the time for repayment were properly arranged.' There would be something in this if the period of improvement was absolutely co-existent with the occupation—began with the tenancy and ended with it—but these improvements are often *inflicted* upon occupiers who have not anticipated their possibility, and who derive no benefit individually in anything like a fair ratio to the burden—the improvement being perhaps, as is often the case, for quite another part of the district under the jurisdiction of the local authority, and in no possible way of any benefit to the unfortunate occupiers who pay for it.

Still, where the loans are incurred for the purpose of constructing works of a somewhat permanent character, like a water supply, it would scarcely be justice to throw the whole burden upon those alone who constructed the undertaking—it is only fair that those who will in the nature of things enjoy the advantages should bear their share of the liabilities. But some reasonable limit should be fixed. A hundred years is too long a time to maintain such liability. It is said that in fixing these long periods regard is had to the probable duration of the works for which the loans are authorised to be contracted. We certainly do not believe that any waterworks can be constructed to last a hundred years intact, and without requiring most costly repairs and alterations. While as for gas works, in the face of the development of the electric light, it is, to say the least of it, full time that very great caution should be exercised in the future authorisation of loans for such a purpose. It appears that of the loans outstanding on December 31, 1878, no less than 19,063,238*l.* had been incurred by urban sanitary authorities in respect of water undertakings, and 9,427,346*l.* in respect of gas undertakings, making a total of 28,490,584*l.* Of this sum more than one-half was made up by the gas and water loans of the urban sanitary authorities of the ten boroughs of Birmingham, Bradford, Halifax, Huddersfield, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, Nottingham, Oldham, and Rochdale. Birmingham, for instance, borrowed 1,985,793*l.*, and Leeds 1,100,000*l.* for gas purposes. Should electric lighting supersede gas lighting it is quite clear that either these places will have to lag behind other places not so burdened, or the inhabitants will have to make enormous sacrifices before they can avail themselves of the advantages of the new discovery. Greater caution should therefore be exercised in the future than has been done in the

past as to length of time to be allowed for the repayment of loans. This evil does not apply so much to loans made by the Public Works Loans Board as to loans authorised by local acts and contracted in the open market.

With a view to restrain even to a slight degree the ardour of the borrowers, whose applications followed so fast one upon another, and for sums of great magnitude, and also to save the Exchequer from loss through money being advanced at a cheap rate of interest, an act was passed in 1879 which provides that where any special acts fix a special rate of interest, and this interest in the judgment of the Treasury is insufficient to save the Exchequer from loss, such interest shall be required as will prevent this; and by a Treasury minute issued soon afterwards the following rates of interest were adopted:—

1. Where the loan is repayable within 20 years, $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.
2. Where repayable between 20 and 30 years, $3\frac{3}{4}$ per cent.
3. Where repayable between 30 and 40 years, 4 per cent.
4. Where repayable at a longer period than 40 years, $4\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.

And the Act also provides that no larger sum than 100,000*l.* shall be advanced in any single financial year to one borrower. This latter provision was very much opposed at the time the Bill was discussed, as calculated to interfere very materially with the carrying out of the Sanitary Acts and the Artisans' Dwellings Act. Its main object undoubtedly was to restrict the applications to the Public Works Loan Board, and to drive the larger borrowing authorities to the open market. Birmingham, with its single application for a loan of one million—which, however, had been granted before the passing of the Act—was too startling.

The provisions of the Act with regard to the rate of interest to be paid will probably save the Exchequer from losses on future transactions; but it is necessary to recollect that out of the twenty-five millions outstanding on past loans, no less than nineteen millions and a quarter bear only $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest, an interest which has been authoritatively stated by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, and was also pointed out to the Select Committee in 1875 by Mr. Welby of the Treasury, to be insufficient to save the Treasury from loss. If $3\frac{1}{2}$ is insufficient interest, those loans which have been made at $3\frac{3}{4}$ must, as a matter of course, involve considerable loss. We have already pointed out that on loans at this lower rate of interest there is outstanding a sum of 1,597,807*l.* Of this

sum 183,467*l.* was advanced under the Cattle Diseases Prevention Act, 1866, which, being in the nature of a national calamity, perhaps called for the assistance of the whole community. The remainder appears to be the balance of advances made under the Harbours and Passing Tolls Act, 1861. The Commissioners have of late years very properly refused to advance loans under this act for commercial docks at the exceptionally low rate of interest, and have restricted their grants at the low rate to such harbours only as are of a refuge character, and therefore of some national importance. The Board of Trade for a long time demurred to this view of the Commissioners, contending that the loans were intended rather for trading harbours than harbours of refuge; but the Commissioners maintained their ground, although at a higher rate of interest they have made advances for harbours and docks for commercial purposes. It is clear enough that there is a certain prospect of considerable losses on past debts, and although some means have been adopted as regards future loans which will perhaps just save the Exchequer, the whole question is in a position which calls for an early and a thorough reconsideration.

Mr. Chamberlain appears to be the only person of any importance who views this question of indebtedness with equanimity. In the debate to which allusion has already been made, he expressed the opinion that indebtedness was a matter of congratulation rather than fear, because it was not a debt in the ordinary sense of the word, but an investment for the benefit of the whole community, bearing often very remunerative interest, and he gave as an illustration his own borough: in 1875 the Corporation of Birmingham had, he thought, a local debt of something like 600,000*l.*; at the time he spoke (April, 1877) it owed nearly 5,000,000*l.* sterling; but if anyone would take the trouble to enquire into the assets, it would be found that they represented more than that amount, and that the interest on the total debts was more than met by the receipts from the profitable undertakings in which Birmingham had put the money, viz., water, gas, and tolls. Complaint, he said, had been made of the length of the terms for repayment of these local loans; but in his opinion there were some reasons why debts of this kind should not be paid off at all. The security given by the local authorities consisted of tangible freehold property, buildings, and other undertakings, and he must again say he did not see, except in some cases as a matter of prudence, why they should be called upon to pay off their indebtedness at all.

Anything more fallacious or more dangerous could not well have been uttered, and coming from a man of proved business capacity and experience such as Mr. Chamberlain, it is astonishing. When uttered the House was simply amused with it, but embedded in Hansard as the matured opinion of one who now occupies an important position in the Cabinet, and whose influence may very much affect the entire question, it becomes absolutely necessary that it should be brought up for consideration. Except that Mr. Chamberlain, in his local connexion with the corporation of Birmingham, had allowed his better judgment to be warped and distorted by his zeal and by the enjoyment of the power of spending vast sums of money, and so of ostensibly, and perhaps really, benefiting his town, it is impossible to understand the frame of mind of a person who can see a benefit and a matter for congratulation in perpetual indebtedness. No doubt it would be very pleasant to the present townsfolk of Birmingham not to be called upon to bear the brunt of the burden which they have thrown upon their town. Could Mr. Chamberlain have secured such a blessing for Birmingham, we have no doubt that great as his influence is there now, it would be much greater. But it is fortunate for the town that even as 'a matter of prudence' it is otherwise. In all business transactions the incubus of a borrowed capital, without the prospect of paying it off, would simply crush out all enterprise, and effectually prevent that expansiveness and elasticity which are so necessary in commercial undertakings. It would answer very well if at once we could attain perfection, and there would be no necessity for any further outlays in the future. But with no assets except such as are fully mortgaged how would it be possible for such a body to go into the market and raise further loans to carry on these works, and to be able to take advantage of new discoveries which at any moment may render their former undertakings valueless and unproductive? Who can tell what the position of gas companies will be twenty years or even ten years hence? And what would happen in case of a serious fall in the value of the assets? The effect would be disastrous. The State would suffer from the ill-secured debt, and the town or locality would be simply crushed with the weight of lost capital. And this reminds us of a very forcible illustration once used by Mr. Chamberlain's colleague, Mr. John Bright, in a speech on the great burden involved in the continuance of the Crimean War. 'Some honourable gentlemen,' said he, 'know what it is to run a horse that has been weightied. I heard, the other day, of a horse that

‘won every race in which it started up to a certain period
‘when it was for the first time weighted. It then lost the
‘race, and it is reported in the annals of the turf that it
‘never won a race afterwards. If that be the case with regard
‘to a horse, it is much more true with regard to a nation.
‘When a nation has gone a step backwards it is difficult to
‘restore it to its position; if another nation has passed it in
‘the race, it is almost impossible for it to regain the ground it
‘has lost.’ And if it is so with a nation, so it is with a locality.
Indebtedness is often but the prelude to insolvency. It is
invariably accompanied with difficulties.

One point of considerable importance to which we have made no previous reference is the fact that, in the matter of the expenditure or application of all this vast amount of money there is an entire absence of anything like an efficient and independent system of audit. It is absolutely certain that not only has much been wasted in ill-advised undertakings, but that a very large portion of these enormous loans has been applied for purposes utterly outside those contemplated when the money was borrowed. It is not suggested that there has been to any very considerable extent a culpable misappropriation, but only that the borrowing authorities, having secured the loans, found it frequently convenient to apply portions of the money to meet other liabilities, to pay off old debts, and other matters. When the loans are contracted in the open market, we take it that the lenders, having satisfied themselves as to the sufficiency of their securities, have no further interest or obligation to see to the due application of their advances. It may be that it would be to their interest, as in law we conceive it would be their right, to see to the proper application of their loans, but as a fact they do not trouble themselves in the question. It is an entirely different matter in the interest of the borrowing localities. An independent audit of the accounts, or an efficient examination into the application of the money, would be a great safeguard and protection, and of the utmost advantage to those upon whom the burden is cast.

The system of auditing the accounts of municipal corporations, which, as the urban sanitary authorities, are chiefly interested in this loan question, is in fact almost worthless, although based on the principle that the parties mostly concerned, that is, the ratepayers, are likely to be most careful in the management of their own affairs, and have therefore the appointment of their own auditors. Frequently enough the auditors are practically suggested, even if not nominated by,

and are certainly elected through the influence of, the town councillors; and very often persons are chosen who are but ill-qualified to overhaul and examine intricate accounts; hence it is a very rare thing indeed that these local authorities are surcharged in respect of unauthorised transactions, for the auditors, satisfied with the production of the vouchers, do not care, or make no inquiry as to the legality or illegality of the payment, and in the City of London, for instance, the auditors are actually selected by and from the very body whose accounts they have to audit, that is, the Court of Common Council. Is there an auditor in existence who would have sanctioned the expenditure of some 12,000*l.* out of the property of the ratepayers—for even if it comes out of the City estate it is the property of the citizens—to be squandered on the Temple Bar memorial? We do not see any reason whatever why the accounts of all local authorities whatsoever should not be subjected to as stringent and as efficient an audit, and by auditors entirely independent of both boards and constituencies, as is now the case with Poor Law authorities and School Boards. We are convinced that if this were done it would have a most wholesome influence, and be of the highest advantage to those who have to suffer the burdens imposed by these local authorities. A step which, so far as it goes, is in the right direction, is the provision contained in the 36th section of the Public Works Loans Act, 1875, which enacts that where the Loans Commissioners advance any loan for any purpose on the security of a rate, it shall be the duty of the Local Government Board to satisfy themselves that the loan is applied to such purpose, and they may from time to time make such examination as they shall deem meet by any officer to be appointed for that purpose, who shall be armed with all the powers vested in inspectors of the Board in matters relating to relief of the poor. We do not see that much has been done under this power. From an occasional paragraph in their annual reports, the Local Government Board appears on the whole to be fairly satisfied that, recently at all events, in the majority of cases investigated by them, the loans have been applied to the purposes for which they were advanced, although they admit that in several instances they found that portions of the loans had been applied towards other purposes than those contemplated when the loan was effected. This, of course, only applies to loans advanced by the Government. In the interest of the localities themselves it is highly desirable that a thorough and independent system of auditing the accounts of all boards and authorities who have the spending of public

money and the imposition of rates, duties, or tolls, should at once be established.

We have now, we think, established the fact that the local indebtedness of this country has assumed portentous dimensions, and also that the system of loans by Government, unless made with great care, is likely to involve the State in great loss. We have shown how ruinous to the State the system has acted hitherto, and how the country at large has had to bear the burden of the debts of localities. We have hinted that the future is not likely to be free from losses in the same respect, and we have also pointed out the hardships and injustice of the incidence of taxation. We venture, therefore, to suggest that the time has arrived when the subject should receive the most earnest attention of statesmen. Local government is at present nothing but a chaos, without order, reason, or system. Mr. Gladstone's Administration in 1868 was pledged to deal with it. A mere attempt--and that an unsuccessful one--was made to touch the fringe of the question. Their successors did no more, although equally pledged. We fear, with the Irish difficulties upon us, there is no present prospect of legislation upon the matter. But there can be no reason whatever why materials for legislation should not at this time be collected and garnered, so as to enable some competent minister to undertake the subject with a view to legislation at an early period. An efficient Royal Commission selected from among men of experience and knowledge would in a very short time be able to sift the whole matter, and to prepare a report which would be of the utmost assistance to whoever might be entrusted with the conduct of any measure of reform through Parliament. Such a Commission would be able to present the essential points of the entire subject, and by their advice would unquestionably simplify the task of the legislator. The Commission should be comprehensive enough in its scope to include every branch of local administration and taxation. The unification of local areas can only be scientifically carried into effect by means of a satisfactory Boundary Commission. This paramount matter should even now be entrusted to competent authorities. With overlapping areas a uniform system cannot exist. It is therefore with some satisfaction that we observe that a bill has been brought into the House of Commons, backed by Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice, Mr. Pell, Mr. James Howard, and Mr. Yorke, to appoint a Commission for this purpose. The main principles which are to guide the Commissioners under this bill in the re-arrangement of boundaries of local government areas are :—

1. That no poor-law parish or union shall extend over the boundary of any county ; 2. That no poor-law parish shall be divided into isolated parts ; 3. That no poor-law parish shall be inconveniently small ; 4. That every highway parish shall be coincident in area with some poor-law parish ; and 5. That every highway district shall be coincident in area with some rural sanitary district. The bill will require exhaustive consideration ; it does not seem to go into the whole question of local areas, but at this juncture we do not propose to discuss its details. The work of such a Commission will be a very heavy one, and will take some years to complete. Indeed, the bill contemplates ten years' work. Hence all the more reason that some steps with this view should be at once taken.

We venture to think that the subject we have here discussed is of vital importance to the country. The best interests of local self-government are involved in it. It is necessary, therefore, that the attention of the public should be called to it, so that we may realise the position we are in, and consider in time whither we are going ; for it cannot be denied that the indebtedness existing at present is sufficiently alarming, and if some restraint is not put on the ardour of borrowers, and some greater degree of caution exercised in sanctioning loans for the future, it may lead to disastrous consequences. There is no greater fallacy than to suppose that popular government is synonymous with cheap government. On the contrary, the more power is thrown into the hands of the democracy, the greater the demands of the democracy on the public purse will become, especially if the burden of taxation rests most heavily on the wealthier classes. At present the system of local taxation by rates weighs more heavily on the agricultural classes and on many of the townspeople than their contributions to the public revenue ; and whilst the imperial finances are subject to the control of ministerial responsibility and parliamentary discussion, the local burdens of the community are augmented by improvident loans and administered by what are practically irresponsible agents. This, therefore, is the branch of our financial administration with which we have the greatest reason to be dissatisfied, and which most urgently demands reform.

INDEX.

A

- Ansted*, Professor, his work on Water and Water Supply reviewed, 417.
- Army organisation*, British, unsatisfactory position of, 184—government of the army at the time of the Crimean War, 185—the Prince Consort's statement of the defects of our military system, 186—Lord Cardwell's reforms, 188—abolition of purchase, 188—short service system, 191—local depôts and linked battalions, 197—the Control Department, 205—general officers, 209.
- Arteveld*, *Jacob van*, review of works connected with the life of, 63—mission of Edward III. to Flanders, 64—resentment of Louis de Nevers, 66—the Cantois appeal to Van Arteveld, 67—misrepresentations by historians of his character and career, 68—the 'brewer' tradition, 79—the Arteveld family, 80—Jacob's service at the French court, 81—appointed by the citizens to the presidency of Ghent, 82—excommunication of the city by order of Philip of Valois, 84—treaty of commerce with Edward III., 86—the Flemings resolve to transfer their allegiance to England, 88—Edward's Flemish charters, 89—the Pope's protest, 90—Arteveld compels the French to raise the siege of Thun l'Évêque, 92—siege of Tournai and Truce of Espluchin, 93—mission of Arteveld's wife to London, 94—principles of his administration, 95—joins the Brewers' Guild, 97—riots arising out of the cloth monopoly, 97—faction fight between the fullers and the weavers, 98—revolt of the townspeople against Arteveld, 99—his death, 100.

B

- Bagenal*, *P. H.*, review of his 'Parnellism Unveiled,' 274.
- Beaconsfield*, Earl, his novel of 'Endymion' reviewed, 103—the author's literary tastes and contemplative habits, 103—impersonations of social influences in his novels, 105—character of 'Endymion,' 107—Zenobia the counterpart of Lady Jersey, 108—Tory and Whig elements, 109—the author's belief in the feminine principle, 111—and in the influence of dress, 114—his exaltations of mean personages, 115—relations between a minister and his secretary, 117—Lord Roehampton, 118—Lord Montfort, 119—Job Thornberry, a portrait of Richard Cobden, 122—defeat of the Melbourne Administration on the corn laws, 123—the House of Commons of 1841, 124—the railway mania, 127—the first Derby Cabinet, 129

C

Caird, Dr. See *Religion*.

Carlyle, Thomas, *Reminiscences of*, reviewed, 469—his eccentricities of style, 470—Sir Henry Taylor's happy description of Carlyle, 471—Carlyle's war with the tendencies of his age, 473—his unconsciousness of art, 475—his father, James Carlyle, 477—his friendship with Edward Irving, 480—a remarkable conversation on Drumclog Moss, 483—his connexion with the Bulls, 485—his description of Mrs. Montagu, 488—his marriage and life at Craigenputtoch, 489—his intimacy with Jeffrey, 490—his lament for Mrs. Carlyle, 493.

Crimea. See *Kinglake*.

D

Darwin, Dr., his work on the Power of Movement in Plants reviewed, 497.

Debts, local, alarming increase of, 549—facilities given by Parliament for borrowing, 554—evil tendency of the long period given for repayment, 555—the system of Government loans, 557—the Public Works Loan Commission, 557—amounts advanced under various acts, 560—closed loans, 562—tabular statement of loan services, 563—liability of bad debts being incurred under the system, 565—remissions by Treasury warrants, 567—actual losses, 569—the rate of interest, 571—injustice of burdening the ratepayers with the charges on loans, 572—the Public Works Loan Act of 1879, 575—Mr. Chamberlain's views, 576—absence of a proper system of audit, 578—proposed Royal Commission, 580

Duffy, Sir Charles Gavan, his 'Young Ireland' reviewed, 274.

E

Egypt, system of government in, prior to 1798, 337—Mohammed Ali's administration, 339—Ismail Pasha's additions to the public debt, 344—Mr. Cave's mission, 347—his report, 350—the Caisse de la Dette, 354—Mr. Goschen's visit to Egypt, 355—downfall of the Moufettich, 356—labours of the Anglo-French Commission of Inquiry, 358—taxation, 361—abuses connected with the *corvée*, 362—Ismail's disclaimer of responsibility, 363—his deposition, 366—the Commission of Liquidation, 368—Riaz Pasha, 369.

Ellenborough, Lord, *Diary of*, reviewed, 390.

Endymion. See *Beaconsfield*.

F

Flanders. See *Arteveld*.

Floods, damage caused in England by, 417—investigations of parliamentary committees, 418—the deputation to the president of the Local Government Board, 421—height of floods in recent years, 422—fluctuations in the fall of rain, 423—floods of continental countries, 424—hydrometers, 425—progress of hydrographic knowledge in France, 427—and in Italy, 428—the Severn, 435—Mr. Symons's hydrological observations, 436—the catastrophe at Szegeidin, 437—

action of rivers, 439—high-water and low-water levels, 440—control of floods, 441—hydrographic division of England, 443—importance of a registry of rainfall, 445.

G

Grove, Dr., his Dictionary of Music and Musicians reviewed, 212—Mendelssohn, 214—Bach, Handel, Beethoven, 216—Mozart and Haydn, 217—Cherubini, Sterndale Bennett, Josquin, Chopin, 222—Hummel, Liszt, Meyerbeer, Best, 223—counterpoint and fugue, 224—harmony, 225—form, 226—melody, 229—Leit-motiv, 229—opera, 231—Wagner, 233—notation, 235—orchestra and orchestration, 236—the organ, 237.

H

Herries, Mr., memoir of, 390—his office of Secretary and Registrar to the Order of the Bath, 395—becomes Commissary-in-Chief, 396—his auditorship of the Civil List, 397—offered a joint secretaryship of the Treasury, 398—Lord Palmerston's notice of Herries in connexion with the Canning Ministry, 400—Herries invited to become Chancellor of the Exchequer under Lord Goderich, 404—embarrassment caused by his refusal and reacceptance of the offer, 404—weakness of Lord Goderich, 405—the king's motives for forcing Herries on the ministry, 407—quarrel between Herries and Huskisson respecting the chairmanship of the Finance Committee, 409—Herries accepts the Mastership of the Mint under Wellington, 413—the verdict on Mr. Herries, 414.

I

Ilios. See *Schliemann*.

Ireland, rise of the agitation in, 274—English feeling towards Ireland, 276—past relations between the two countries, 277—English concessions during the last fifty years, 278—character of the agitation, 279—necessity of repressive measures, 280—the peasant proprietorship scheme, 284—the three F's, 289—eviction, 291—the demand of a grant of money from the British Treasury, 292—measures required by the state of things, 293—real object of the Land League, 294—Sir Charles Duffy's book, 'Young Ireland,' 295—the Irish agitators in America, 296—language of Mr. Parnell, 298—reasons for the continuance of the Union, 300.

Italy. See *Laveleye*.

K

King, J. W., his 'War-ships and Navies of the World' reviewed, 31.

Kinglake, A. W., sixth volume of his history of the Crimean War reviewed, 241—his epithets for the nurses, 243—sufferings of the soldiers in the winter of 1854, 246—alleged to be due to the interference of the personal sovereign in war administration, 250—Mr. Kinglake's defence of Lord Raglan, 261.

Kronenfels, J. F. von, his work on the ships of the naval powers reviewed, 33.

L

Laveleye, Emile de, review of his letters on Italy, 164—decay of the religious principle throughout the kingdom, 166—his conversation at Venice with M. Fambri, 167—Minghetti, 168—the Italian Parliament, 169—electoral statistics, 170—education, 171—universities, 172—pressure of taxation, 172—prevalence of crime, 174—the Pontine marshes, 175—Government scheme of sylviculture, 176—Dr. Pantaleoni's letter, 178—modern costume, 179—condition of the people, 179—summary of the state of Italy, 181—the Papal question, 183

Lettenhove, Kervyn de, his history of Van Arteveld reviewed, 63.

M

Metternich, Prince, *Memoirs of*, reviewed—Metternich's declarations relative to his own character, 1—the autobiography contradicted by his despatches and other documents, 4—state of affairs on his appointment to the embassy at Berlin, 5—invites Prussia to join Austria and Russia against France, 6—his calculations concerning Frederic's policy, 7—thwarted by Haugwitz, who signs a treaty of alliance with France, 8—nominated to the French embassy by Napoleon, 9—treaty of Fontainebleau, 10—peace of Tilsit, 10—his views of Napoleon's scheme for the partition of Turkey, 11—Spanish insurrection, 12—conversations with Napoleon on the Austrian armaments, 13—his views at Vienna of the situation, 16—war declared by Napoleon against Austria, 18—Count Stadion's views, 19—Prince Lichtenstein tricked into signing a treaty of peace, 20—Metternich assumes the administration of foreign affairs, 20—Napoleon's Austrian marriage, 20—policy of Austria in the French quarrel with Russia, 25—Metternich's designs upon Silesia, 27—secret treaty of Prague, 29—opposed to Alexander's policy, 30—true estimate of Metternich's character, 30

Music. See *Grove*.

O

O'Hagan, review of his translation of the 'Song of Roland,' 371.

Oxford, religious revival of, in the early years of the present century, 308—rise of the Oxford School in 1834, 309—Dr. Newman, 311—John Keble, 315—Dr. Pusey, 316—Dr. Hampden, 317—publication of Tract XC., 318—measures of repression against Mr. Ward's book, 319—sudden collapse of the movement, 323—revived by the Gorham controversy, 324—Bishop Wilberforce's leadership of the party, 327—revival of Convocation, 331—Church assemblies, 332—the ascetic spirit, 333.

Pellagra, nature and effects of, 449—parts of Italy subject to it, 450—not known in cities and towns, 451—its presence in other countries, 451—condition of the peasants of Pavia, 454—connexion of the disease with the people's maize diet, 464.

Plants, Dr. Darwin's work on the power of movement in, reviewed, 497—apparatus employed by Dr. Darwin in his observations, 499—circumnutation of growing plants, 501—the so-called sleep of leaves, 503—shown to be a form of circumnutation, 504—its purpose to protect the leaves against too rapid radiation of heat at night, 504—wonderful faculties of the tips of rootlets, 505—power of movement in plants compared with the motor power in animals, 506—movements of the amoeba, 508—the ciliary movement, 513.

R

Religion, Dr. Caird's Introduction to the Philosophy of, reviewed, 130—the critical spirit a necessity of religion, 130—philosophy of Hegel embodied in the work, 132—meaning of the phrase 'Philosophy of Religion,' 131—possibility of a scientific treatment of religion, 138—Mr. Spencer's theory of the relativity of human knowledge, 141—origin of religion, 143—true interpretation of the so-called proofs of the existence of God, 145—conception of God, 148—conclusions of the Upanishads, 151—comparative history of religion, 152—claims of Christianity to divine origin in presence of a law of evolution, 157—the universal element in religion, 162.

Religion, English, of the eighteenth century, 305.

Roland, Song of, 371—first English translation, 373—outline of the story with extracts, 371—merits of the poem, 386—the original manuscript, 389.

S

Schliemann, Dr., the 'Ilios' of, reviewed—competitors for the honour of representing Troy, 514—vicissitudes of popular belief in regard to the Homeric legend, 517—solar and Euhemeristic methods of explanation, 518—probable historical substratum, 518—real purport of the supernatural element, 521—Homer's data concerning the position and surroundings of Ilium, 521—Dr. Schliemann's confusion as to Homer's chronological relation to the events of his tale, 525—strata of Hissarlik representing prehistoric cities, 528—historical records of the Greek Ilium, 534—assumed depth of the remains, 537—belief of the ancient Greeks as to the site of Troy, 538—their disbelief in its identity with Ilium, 539—conclusions to be drawn from Dr. Schliemann's researches, 544—their bearing in relation to the 'Iliad,' 546

Sullivan, Sir E., on Premature Enlistment, reviewed, 184.

Symons, G. J., his work on Rain reviewed, 417.

V

Vanderkindere, Professor, his work on the Artevelde reviewed, 63.

Very, Lieutenant, his 'Navies of the World' reviewed, 33.

W

War-ships and Navies of the World, review of works by Mr. King and other authors relating to, 31—literary neglect of the subject in

England, 32—the march of improvement in ironclads, 35—France, 36—Italy, 39—Germany, 41—Austria, 42—Russia, 42—United States, 44—Spain, 45—Holland, Sweden, Brazil, 46—Chili, Peru, Japan, China, 47—condition of the British Navy, 50—turret-ships, 50—new ship ‘Polyphemus,’ 53—broadside ships, 54—un-armoured cruisers, 55—steel cruisers, 56—torpedoes and machine guns, 57—gun armaments of ships, 58—comparative strength of the British and French navies, 59—efficiency and low relative cost of our navy, 62.

Wilberforce, Bishop, Life of, reviewed, 305.

END OF VOL. CLIII.

